

Pointing out that small business believes strongly in the necessity for keeping competition strong and vigorous, Hokanson said: "The competition small business believes in is fair competition as opposed to the 'anything goes' type of contest in which a smaller rival can be crushed without restraint, so long as so-called competitive methods are used to accomplish this purpose."

Since the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, in 1936, Hokanson wrote Senator CAPEHART, its purpose has been to protect competition by encouraging price cuts to small as well as large business. For this reason, he added, it is disturbing to independent distributors that those who are attacking the Robinson-Patman Act are attempting to stigmatize the act as preventing competition, although the act has never prohibited anyone from competing or from meeting competition. "It does require, however, that when a price cut is given to a big mass distributor it also be given on equal terms to merchants who are competing with him," Hokanson said.

He asserted that, in view of the economic issues involved in the current assault on the Robinson-Patman Act, "it is clear that what is at stake is not freedom to compete but elemental justice and equality of opportunity for business, regardless of size. We have seen time and time again that a competitive balance between big business and small business is not possible unless both are on equal footing so that efficiency and not size or financial power will determine success or failure."

It has been fortunate for our economy, Hokanson continued, that the Robinson-Patman Act has helped to keep the field of food distribution open for small firms to enter, prosper and grow.

Resulting from the fact that equality of opportunity has prevailed since the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, consumers have benefited from substantial progress in improved distribution techniques and other advancements, he said, notable among these being the modern self-service supermarket pioneered by independent food retailers.

"The retail food business is one segment of our economy where independent distributors have been given a fair chance to show what they can do and they have 'delivered the goods,'" the NARGUS president declared.

Warning of the threat of persistent efforts to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to legalize systematic price discriminations, Hokanson wrote: "If permitted, we will once again return to the two-price system under which a few very large distributors will get a low price from manufacturers while small distributors will be left with a serious competitive disadvantage from which they can never escape."

Hokanson requested Senator CAPEHART's considered opinion on this grave problem. "It is my hope you will agree with me that efforts to legalize injurious price discrimination should be resisted by all who support free competitive enterprise in this country," he concluded.

Michigan Week: Michigan State Society White Pine Tree Planting Southeast Lawn, United States Capitol, May 17, 1955, 9:30 a. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, buttressed by four lovely Michigan princesses, I have been honored in responding to the commanding invitation from Col. I. D. Brent, the distinguished president of the Michigan State Society, to plant upon these magnificent Capitol Grounds a virile and beautiful white pine sapling of great prospect and future promise. By what right, other than seniority, I was chosen to do the honors on the southeast lawn this morning matters naught. The thing that is important is that Michigan's symbolic tree, the great white pine, was planted here in connection with Michigan Week simultaneously being observed throughout our great State. It is important to note that this sapling is not only symbolic of the great strength, spaciousness and wealth of Michigan, but it is the same white pine at which at one time served as nature's covering for Michigan terrain from the southeast corner to the very tip of the Upper Peninsula some eight or nine hundred miles away. It was this great blanket of wealth-producing vegetation that created some of the greatest, most lasting and prodigiously expansive fortunes which developed and today underlay the great industries centered in Michigan, the Peninsular State.

A brief but significant and hopeful program was laid out surrounding the

planting ceremonies, a copy of which I shall attach to these remarks. The program quite properly included an invocation and a benediction, together with the historic Michigan State song which wafted melodiously over the breeze upon the silver tones emanating from the throat of my gifted colleague and friend of the 14 District, Congressman LOUIS RABAUT. All of those assembled for this short but impressive ceremony prayed silently in their hearts that this little white pine tree proffered by a Home State Association would, under these auspicious circumstances, take root, grow great and strong, lifting its head ever higher and higher toward heaven and God to pay its Creator the homage we all owe Him, and that in the far distant future the white pine sapling grown to the unbelievable heights of its mighty possibilities might give inspiration to the wayfarer and the tourist, and cast its comforting shadow in the heat of the summer's day upon the statesmen and lawmakers, whom God grant shall continue successfully to struggle with the problems of our beloved Nation, and to aid in the maintenance and preservation of universal peace throughout the world.

The program follows:

MICHIGAN WEEK: MICHIGAN STATE SOCIETY
WHITE PINE TREE PLANTING, SOUTHEAST
LAWN, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MAY 17, 1955,
9:30 A. M.

Music..... Bolling Air Force Band
Lieutenant Meuser, leader
Invocation..... Father Quinn
Archdiocese of Washington
Master of ceremonies..... Col. I. D. Brent
Michigan State Society
Singing..... Michigan, My Michigan
Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, Member of Congress,
Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.
Address..... Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER
United States Senator, Cheboygan,
Mich.
Presentation of white pine tree.....
Hon. PATRICK V. McNAMARA
United States Senator, Detroit, Mich.
Official pages..... The Michigan Agricultural
Princesses
Planting..... Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL
Member of Congress, Detroit, Mich.
Acceptance of white pine tree.....
Hon. J. George Stewart
Architect of the Capitol
National Anthem..... Bolling Air Force Band
Benediction... Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D.
Chaplain, United States House of
Representatives (University of Mich-
igan, 1908)

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2,
1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast revealed Thyself to the ever-changing lives of men, in the word made flesh which stands fast forever, speak now to our hearts as we wait upon Thee. Remind us of all Thy mercies which have shown forth Thy love in the past, and in that love make us on the holy ground of each

present day steadfast and sure. Hold steadily before our eyes that pure will of Thine for us until we learn to choose it above all earthly allurements and the esteem of men. Make our timorous faith more sure, and our high, if bewildered, loyalties firm. Knowing that out of the travail of many a violent age a great birth has come, by Thy providence keep our faith steady, lest for the lack of it we lose what Thou dost intend in this prophetic day. We ask it in the name of that One whose coming broke the ages in two and who is now revered and adored while the violent are forgotten. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis;

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5559. An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 6239. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5559. An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6239. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the chairmanship of Mr. HOLLAND was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES MISSION TO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZA- TION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer for assignment in the rank of general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read 6,109 routine nominations in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, which were on the desk, but not printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the confirmation, en bloc, of these nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DE- PARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the conferees on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill have reached an agreement. The report is available. I have discussed it with the acting minority leader [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the representatives on the minority side. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROBERTSON] has the report. He has an understanding with the House that it is agreeable for the Senate to proceed with its consideration, and I should like to have him submit it at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed, insert "one hundred and seventy-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$282,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,870,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$661,620,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$157,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOE MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the concessions made by the Senate conferees in the report.

I am happy to submit to the Senate the report, which was unanimously adopted by the conferees. Under the report, neither the Treasury Department nor the Post Office Department will receive all the appropriations which had been recommended for them in the budget message. Yet in the opinion of the conferees, in the report those Departments were allowed sufficient funds to enable them to function successfully, if they practice strict economy.

The bill now contains a total of \$3,322,488,500, an increase of \$39,935,500 over the amount of the bill as it passed the House, and a decrease of \$36,133,500 under the amount passed by the Senate. The bill is \$37,896,500 under the budget estimate of \$3,360,385,000.

For the Treasury Department the bill now provides \$599,598,000; for the Post Office Department, \$2,721,720,500; for the Tax Court of the United States, \$1,170,000.

On amendments Nos. 1 and 4, the House receded, permitting the office of a third Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to be continued, and supplying \$30,000 for the salaries of that Assistant Secretary and his assistants.

In regard to amendment No. 2, the House had allowed 50 of the 100 additional automobiles requested by the Internal Revenue Service for Alcohol and Tobacco Tax investigators. The Senate had recommended 100. The conferees agreed on 75, thus providing needed transportation for the investigators enforcing these provisions of law.

The conferees agreed on a total of \$282,250,000 for the Internal Revenue Service, thus enabling the Service to hire needed additional tax enforcement agents to its staff during the coming year. This is a reduction of \$3,750,000 from the amount recommended by the

Senate, and an increase of the same amount over that provided by the House.

The Senate receded on amendment No. 5, "Payments for Special Services" in the Post Office Department. This item was requested in the budget, was deleted by the House, and was restored by the Senate. It would have permitted the Post Office Department to credit to postal revenues \$10,362,000 from the general fund of the Treasury for items which by law are mailed free of charge, at less than cost, or, in the case of the transportation of United States mail by foreign carriers, the excess of the Universal Postal Union rate over the rate prescribed for United States carriers. It would not have increased the appropriation. However, there was some thought that this might better be considered by the proper legislative committees, and so I recommend to the Post Office Department that avenue of approach.

For amendment No. 6, Post Office "Operations," the House had granted \$1,850,000,000; and the Senate, \$1,886,363,000. The conferees agreed on \$1,870,000,000—a figure \$20 million over the House figure and \$16,363,000 under the Senate figure.

For amendment No. 7, Post Office "Transportation," the House had recommended \$648 million, and the Senate \$675,241,000. The conferees agreed on \$661,620,500. This is \$13,620,500 under the Senate figure and the same amount over the House figure.

For amendment No. 8, the conferees agreed on an amount of \$157,400,000. This is \$2,400,000 over the House figure and the same amount under the Senate figure.

The principal question involved in the last three amendments was one of mail volume. The House believed that the Post Office Department's estimate of contemplated mail volume was likely to be overstated. The Senate's position was that recent experience, according to the Post Office Department, indicated that mail volume might well be understated, rather than overstated, and that important expansions and improvements in service might be placed in jeopardy if these cuts were maintained. The compromise arrived at will certainly alleviate this situation.

Amendment No. 9, as provided by the Senate, granted the United States Tax Court an additional \$135,000, and was a supplemental budget estimate, not considered previously by the House. The House conferees agreed to this amendment, which would provide salary increases for members of the Tax Court, as provided by Public Law 9, which this Congress passed.

I believe that the conference report is a reasonable compromise between the Senate and House positions, and I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he remembers the amount voted for the item providing for the im-

provement of buildings and quarters in which the postal employees work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The House conferees and Senate conferees compromised 50-50 on that "Facilities" item.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from Virginia remember the amount?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The original budgeted amount was \$159,800,000 for "Facilities," of which \$9,500,000 was for the building-improvement program. The House cut "Facilities" by \$4,800,000, which the Senate restored. The conferees split the total difference.

Mr. CARLSON. As I remember, the House voted a total of \$4,800,000 less than the amount requested for "Facilities," and the modernization program might therefore have been affected.

Regardless of that, the amount agreed to in the conference report for the appropriation is, as I understand, a 50-50 compromise between the amount voted by the House and the amount voted by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that is correct.

The postal authorities were not too much disturbed over the compromise to which we agreed. We feel that suitable progress in respect to better lighting facilities, and so forth, can be made with the amount agreed upon. The conferees on the part of the Senate were not able to have the report include the increased amount voted by the Senate, but were able to include half of that amount. We thought we had better compromise on that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that I think the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia has done an excellent job in connection with the report. I know some of the difficulties connected with it.

I have mentioned this item because there are post offices which certainly need improvement in respect to the working conditions of the employees; and I am happy to have funds for that purpose made available.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate as a whole fully agreed with the distinguished Senator from Kansas; and in the conference the conferees on the part of the Senate voted for the full amount of the budget estimate; we did not think it too much. But the amount which we were able to have the House conferees accept, and which is contained in the conference report, will enable the Post Office Department to take care of the most urgent cases. We shall certainly consider the matter again next year.

The large increase in the bill, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas knows, is the \$20 million-plus for operations, and another large item was for the uniforms for which Congress had made provision. Of course, if an employee is promised a uniform, it cannot be said, "Let us cut it in half."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the customary 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS IN THE CASE OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EQUALIZATION OF CERTAIN RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the borrowing authority, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

STUDY ENTITLED "CORPORATE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Commission's study entitled "Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers on the files of the Veterans' Administration which are not needed in the

conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposal (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as it relates to the special school milk program, to the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has enacted legislation to increase milk consumption in the schools of the Nation; and

"Whereas the benefits of this legislation have been extended to all States without regard to milk production within the States; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has been excluded from participation in this program and thereby denied the benefits enjoyed by the States of improved child health through the stimulation of milk consumption and the development of milk drinking habits; and

"Whereas the exclusion of the Territory of Hawaii from participation in the national school milk program is discriminatory to Hawaii: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to extend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as it relates to the special school milk program, to the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 33

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation permitting the conveyance of public lands at Wellwell, Kona, Island of Kauai, T. H., to certain claimants

"Whereas for over 25 years there has existed a dispute between the Territory of Hawaii and various private parties as to the legal ownership of a tract of land situate at Wellwell, Kona, Island of Kauai; and

"Whereas the Territory contends that the land is now and always has been government land; and

"Whereas a number of persons have heretofore purchased in good faith and for adequate consideration from private sources lots in said tract of land; and

"Whereas the sale of these lots to such persons was made upon the assumption that said lots were private property and not government land; and

"Whereas it is just and equitable that the government quitclaim its title to said lands for a fair consideration to those person or persons claiming under color of title: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested, any provision of the laws of Hawaii relating to public lands and section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary notwithstanding, to enact legislation permitting the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the governor, and two-thirds of the members of the board of public lands to convey by quitclaim deeds to the person or persons claiming under color of title any lot in the tract of land described as follows:

"'PORTION OF THE GOVERNMENT LAND OF WELI-WELI AT WELIWELI, KONA, KAUAI

"'Being portion of the government land of Weliweli occupied and claimed by various persons as portions of grant 1408 to Kaulahewa and grant 1416 to Eke Oponui.

"'Beginning at a pipe in ahu at the north-west corner of this parcel of land and on the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli, said pipe in ahu marking the end of course 40 of Land Court Application 956 and being the initial point of lot A of Land Court Application 1188, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23298.80 feet south and 2361.40 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 261° 57' 30" 328.40 feet along Land Court Application 1188 to a pipe;

"'2. 14° 22' 00" 573.10 feet along grant 1408 to Kaulahewa to a pipe set in top of stone wall.

"'3. 117° 30' 00" 46.10 feet along R. P. 3750 L. C. Aw. 3359, Apana 1 to Nihau to a pipe;

"'4. 348° 30' 00" 102.90 feet along R. P. 3750, L. C. Aw. 3359, Apana 1 to Nihau to a pipe;

"'5. 14° 22' 00" 86.36 feet along grant 1408 to Kaulahewa and grant 1416 to Eke Oponui;

"'6. 105° 35' 00" 21.81 feet along Land Court Application, 1373;

"'7. 8° 38' 00" 112.00 feet along Land Court Application 1373 to seashore at high-water mark;

"'Thence along seashore at highwater mark for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seashore being:

"'8. 68° 56' 30" 117.28 feet;

"'9. 74° 53' 00" 54.75 feet;

"'10. 65° 18' 00" 173.90 feet; thence

"'11. 193° 27' 932.00 feet along the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli to the point of beginning and containing a Gross Area of 260,335 Square Feet after deducting and excluding therefrom the following-described parcel of land being the present Kual and Poipu Roads and additional areas required for widening said roads to a width of 50 feet:

"'Beginning at the west corner of this parcel of land, on the new south side of Poipu Road and on the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23902.35 feet south and 2217.06 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 193° 27' 00" 50.03 feet along the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli;

"'2. 285° 33' 00" 96.98 feet along the new north side of Poipu Road;

"3. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 239° 55' 30" 28.59 feet;

"4. 194° 18' 00" 565.43 feet along the new west side of Kual Road;

"5. Thence along the west side of Kual Road, on a curve to the left with a radius of 329.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 192° 58' 04" 38.55 feet;

"6. 261° 57' 30" 52.91 feet along Land Court Application 1188;

"7. Thence along the new east side of Kual Road, on a curve to the right with a radius of 879.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 12° 23' 13" 58.69 feet;

"8. 14° 18' 00" 567.39 feet along the new east side of Kual Road;

"9. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 329° 55' 30" 27.97 feet;

"10. 285° 33' 00" 107.56 feet along the new north side of Poipu Road;

"11. 14° 22' 00" 39.81 feet along grant 1416 to Eke Oponuni;

"12. 105° 33' 00" 21.81 feet along Land Court Application 1373;

"13. 8° 33' 00" 10.28 feet along Land Court Application 1373;

"14. 105° 33' 00" 272.98 feet along the new south side of Poipu Road to the point of beginning and containing an area of 46410 square feet.

"Reserving also to the Territory of Hawaii in perpetuity an easement fifteen (15) feet wide for storm drain purposes upon and across that portion of the government land of Wellwell occupied by the B. D. Baldwin Trust Estate, running from the new south side of Poipu Road to the sea, described as follows:

"Being a strip of land 15.00 feet wide, extending for 7.50 feet on each side of the centerline described as follows:

"Beginning at the north end of this right-of-way on the new south side of Poipu Road, at a point which is 105° 33' 00" 131.49 feet from the end of Course 15 of the road exclusion as described above, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAAU-KAHI" being 23940.28 feet south and 2353.37 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"1. 359° 19' 00" 178.00 feet to seashore at highwater mark."

"Sec. 2. The lots shall be conveyed for a fair and reasonable price, which price shall be determined by a disinterested appraiser or appraisers, but not more than three to be appointed by the Governor of Hawaii, and all improvements thereon shall be valued at \$1.00.

"Sec. 3. Before the commissioner executes quitclaim deeds, the respective claimants shall quitclaim to the Territory any claim they may have in and to the roadways hereinabove described, and confirm the easement hereinabove referred to.

"Sec. 4. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 5. The joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved the 13th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 35

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation granting the status of public lands to certain tidal reef lands and authorizing the Commissioner of Public Lands to lease same for a period of 55 years

"Whereas that certain tidal reef lying off the Ala Moana Park in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., and being bounded

by the Kewalo Channel, the Kewalo Basin, the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor Channel, and the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor, is not devoted to any beneficial or economic use; and

"Whereas said tidal reef is capable of being developed as a resort and recreation area to the great advantage of the people of Hawaii and the enhancement of the tourist industry provided the Territory is able to lease the same for a term of years sufficient to permit the expense of such development to be capitalized; and

"Whereas to effect such a long-term lease of said tidal reef congressional authority is required: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands with the consent of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands, Territory of Hawaii, to lease certain tidal reef lands for a term not to exceed 55 years; and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested and urged to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"A bill granting the status of public lands to certain tidal reef lands and authorizing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to lease same for a term not to exceed 55 years

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"SECTION 1. The tidal reef lands described in section 2 of this act are hereby given the status of public lands within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141) and placed under the control of the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, interposes no objection thereto, the Commissioner of Public Lands with the consent of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands, Territory of Hawaii, is authorized to lease all or any portion of said tidal reef lands for terms not to exceed 55 years and to permit or require the filling of said tidal reef lands and the use thereof for private or public purposes. Any such lease shall be sold at public auction and may contain such terms, covenants, and conditions as the Commissioner of Public Lands may deem proper and as are approved by the said Board of Public Lands.

"SEC. 2. The tidal reef lands to which this act refers are more particularly described as follows:

"Portion of Ala Moana Reef area.

"Kukuluao and Kalia, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.

"Beginning at the northeast corner of this parcel of land and on the south boundary of Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928), the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station 'Punchbowl' being 8,958.47 feet south and 1,669.86 feet east, as shown on Government survey registered map 1986, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"1. 18°15'30" 2,048.55 feet;

"2. 45°00' 325.31 feet along area transferred to the Territory of Hawaii by Presidential proclamation 1856, dated October 27, 1928;

"3. 117°32'05" 5,391.68 feet along line of breakers;

"4. 214°00' 940.98 feet;

"5. 276°52'30" 1,029.97 feet;

"6. 212°55' 520.00 feet to the south corner of addition to Kewalo Basin (Governor's Executive Order 1330);

"7. 307°55' 496.30 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"8. 291°44' 437.70 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"9. 286°37' 173.30 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"10. 278°56' 412.60 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"11. 287°07' 718.00 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"12. 292°09' 476.80 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"13. 297°52' 359.40 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"14. 285°05' 1,040.00 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928) to the point of beginning and containing an area of 222,684 acres.

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval."

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 36

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the restrictive covenant in land patent No. 10,410

"Whereas land patent No. 10,410, covering certain lands at Ponahawai, South Hilo, Island of Hawaii, contains a restrictive covenant requiring that said lands be used for school purposes only; and

"Whereas the owners and users of said lands desire to have their premises usable for both religious and school purposes: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"A bill to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs and assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the consent of the Governor of said Territory of Hawaii, be authorized to amend the restrictive covenant set forth in land patent No. 10,410, so that said restrictive covenant will read as follows:

"The land herein described and conveyed is granted and conveyed upon the covenant running with the land, that said land is to be used for religious and/or school purposes only, and in the event of its being used for other than religious and/or school purposes, this patent shall become void, and the whole of said land, together with the fee thereof, and the improvements thereon, shall, without warrant or other legal process, immediately revert to and revert in the Territory of Hawaii."

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval."

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to place under control of the Territory lands held but not in use by the Armed Forces

"Whereas large areas of the lands in the Territory of Hawaii held by the Armed Forces of the United States are not being used by the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the use of these lands by the Territory would prove of great benefit to the people of Hawaii: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be requested to place under the control of the Territory all lands held by the United States Armed Forces and not being used by them as determined by the duly authorized and empowered agencies or departments of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"Sec. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by Bushwick Council, No. 132, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of the Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1718. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954; with an amendment (Rept. No. 368).

JURISDICTION OVER CRIMINAL OFFENSES ARISING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS TO CERTAIN STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. 357)

Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 51) to amend the act entitled "To confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request): S. 2025. A bill for the relief of Filippo Alcolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2026. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with and among the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of tung oil and of those engaged in the domestic tung nut and tung oil producing industry, to promote the export trade of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: S. 2027. A bill to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 2028. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2029. A bill to change the name of Hulah Dam and Hulah Reservoir, located on Caney River, a tributary of Verdigris River, to Lake O' the Osages Dam and Lake O' the Osages, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: S. 2030. A bill for the relief of Chuza Tamotzu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT: S. 2031. A bill for the relief of Gurli Thovtrup Putnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: S. 2032. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered the adopted child of a deceased individual where such individual, before his death, had filed an appropriate petition for the adoption of such child; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 2033. A bill to provide for the creation of an Office of Administrator for Legal Assignments for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: S. 2034. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: S. 2035. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Hernandez-Valencia;

S. 2036. A bill for the relief of Rosa Roppo; and

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child Hans Knoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations

for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1048, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON NEW YORK HARBOR, ENTRANCE CHANNELS, AND ANCHORAGE AREA (S. DOC. NO. 45)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated February 16, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the New York harbor, entrance channels, and anchorage area, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, June 9, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the report was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson, re-assigned; and

Richard Lee Jones, of Illinois, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to Liberia, vice Jesse D. Locker, deceased.

I wish to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there was published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star an article by an able columnist, Mr. Gould Lincoln, which bears directly on the report which was made to the President by Secretary Dulles with respect to his accomplishments on his last trip to Europe. This article is such a worthy tribute to Mr. Dulles and the President, in connection with our foreign policy, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES BRINGS HOME THE BACON
(By Gould Lincoln)

For 2½ years two steadfast men—President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles—have followed a policy and program they believed would make war less certain and peace a better prospect. It has been tough going. But over the last weekend the Secretary of State brought home the bacon—a large slice, any way you look at it. Finally, the way was cleared for a united Western Europe, with the German republic integrated. It becomes a member of NATO and is able to rearm. The Austrian treaty of peace was signed, making that country an independent nation again after 17 years. A neutral nation—but neutral along the lines of a neutral Switzerland. It can rearm for its own defense.

AT THE SUMMIT

The President and his Secretary of State, with these successes in sight, recently agreed to engage in a four-power conference "at the summit"—the heads of governments taking part—which would involve the United States, Britain, France, and Soviet Russia. The purpose: To explore the world situation. Immediately there arose a clatter—such a conference, it was shouted, would mean appeasement of the Communists; it could result only in loss by the United States and the other nations of the free world. It came principally from Republican throats. Eisenhower and Dulles, it was implied, if not actually predicted, would sell us down the river. The answer is simple and easy to make—Eisenhower and Dulles have never appeased the Reds in any item. Why, therefore, should they appease them now—particularly when the situation of the free world has vastly improved?

While President Eisenhower has had strong and able support of the Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and other Democrats, in and out of Congress, in his conduct of foreign policy, there have been plenty of Democrats to charge, not that the President and the Secretary of State were engaged in appeasement, but that they were insulting our close friends abroad, and bringing about hatred for America and loss of prestige abroad. These charges were made no longer ago than April 16—when Democrats gathered here from all parts of the country to honor Speaker SAM RAYBURN. But what is the real truth? Our allies are closer than ever before, first, because they see the results of our program, and second, because they understand our aims better—and the principal aim is peace. Further, the prestige of the United States abroad, instead of being diminished, has mounted.

APPEASEMENT OUT

President Eisenhower, when questioned at his most recent press conference, flatly rejected any idea of appeasement of the Communists as a possible result of the coming four-power conference. Rightly or wrongly, the President and his Secretary of State have come to the conclusion that out of a conference of heads of Government, including the President himself, some good may come. Fulfilling his promise to go anywhere, any time, to help the cause of international peace, the President has joined in the invitation to the Russian Communists for a conference—an invitation which has now been accepted. He has warned the American people, however, against too sanguine hopes. No Communist wool has been pulled over the President's eyes. He understands today—just as he did yesterday and the day before—that the goal of the Communists is world domination. Nevertheless, he is willing now

to sit down with the Soviet Russians to review the world situation, on the chance that the latter are willing to take another look before they force hot war upon the world.

Mr. Dulles has been the butt of partisan jokes as the greatest traveler since the Sphinx sat itself down in the Libyan Desert. He has been the greatest traveler. He has shuttled back and forth across the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. In 1 week he flew twice across the Atlantic. He has been indefatigable. The laugh, however, is his. For he has succeeded far beyond the imagination of his detractors.

FLOOD THREATS IN BRADY CREEK WATERSHED, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday morning radio and television programs in the Washington area carried alarming reports of flood threats in the Brady, Tex., area. Heavy, concentrated rainfall in the Brady Creek watershed, an area of 846 square miles, sent water pouring into Brady Creek, which has flooded frequently in the past.

The first reports indicated that this flood would be a repetition of past disaster. People were being evacuated from the town of Brady. Sandbag barriers were erected in the downtown area. Store windows were boarded up. The National Guard was called out, and the Red Cross ordered cots and blankets sent into the area.

As a Senator from Texas I was greatly concerned. As soon as I could get through a telephone call I talked with my friend, Bob Bray, publisher of the Brady Herald, to obtain an up-to-the-minute report on the situation.

Mr. Bray told me that measures had been taken to meet the danger of a flood, but that he believed Brady Creek would not reach flood stage.

Later in the day I received the following telegram from Mr. Bray:

Your telephone call offering assistance in our emergency strongly appreciated. Dick Winters credits structures completed on Brady Creek watershed project with preventing disastrous flood. Strongly urge your continued support in speedy completion of this project.

I knew exactly what the telegram meant.

The Brady Creek watershed project is a project authorized by the Congress of the United States, calling for the building of 46 water-retarding structures on the creek. That project has been proceeding slowly because of inadequate appropriations. But 4 of the dams already have been completed.

Mr. President, those four dams are credited with saving the Brady area from a disastrous flood this week.

That fact, in my judgment, emphasizes the importance of going forward with this project—and similar authorized projects, wherever they may be located—with as much speed as possible.

The Dick Winters mentioned in Mr. Bray's telegram is president of the Brady Creek Watershed Association. Mr. Winters has led the far-sighted effort on behalf of this upstream flood-control and water-conservation project. He has been joined by numerous other progressive citizens—Mr. Joe T. Ogden; Mr.

Bray; Mr. L. B. Smith, publisher of the Brady Standard; Mr. Earl Rudder, of Brady, Texas land commissioner; Mr. A. H. Floyd, principal of the Brady Junior High School; and others who have been instrumental in securing substantial local cash participation in this project.

Mr. President, I am proud of the part I have had in forwarding the Brady Creek watershed project. I am deeply gratified that I am able to give this report to the Senate of the beneficial results already obtained from completion of a fractional part of the work.

This is American Government at its best—cooperation between Washington and a Texas community in the interest of all the people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I was present in the sessions of the Committee on Appropriations when the items involving this particular project were under consideration. It is most gratifying to me, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to see that the moneys appropriated and expended have brought such great benefits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it was 179 years ago that the American people declared themselves free and independent. With the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, the people of America started building the greatest country on earth.

Today, Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Senate an event that took place more than 1 full year prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

It is an event to which the people of North Carolina point with a great deal of pride. On May 20, 1775, the people of Mecklenburg County met and adopted the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. That declaration—adopted more than a year prior to July 4, 1776, mind you—gave notice to the New World that the people of Mecklenburg County were a free and independent people.

Over the years since that great event, the people of Mecklenburg County have joined in colorful celebration each May 20 to pause and take notice of the action of their forefathers. At this very moment, this event is being celebrated again in the city of Charlotte.

Through the years there has been some controversy among historians over the Mecklenburg Declaration. It seems that the actual records of the meeting at which the declaration was adopted were destroyed in a fire.

Whether or not actual records exist of the historic meeting is unimportant. The important thing is the fact that the people of North Carolina took determined action to satisfy their hunger for freedom long before the Declaration of Independence was signed.

It is fitting, Mr. President, that today there sits in the diplomatic gallery a scholar who is intimately connected with Mecklenburg County and the events surrounding the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. He is Dr. Archibald Henderson, one of the outstanding scientists, historians, biographers, and philosophers of our time. His great-great-grandfather settled in Mecklenburg County and was the county's first high sheriff. Throughout America, Dr. Henderson is known as one of the most learned scholars in the field of North Carolina history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Henderson be permitted to rise and be recognized.

The President pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

(Thereupon, Dr. Henderson rose from his place in the gallery, and was greeted with applause.)

Mr. SCOTT. The Mecklenburg Historical Association has just published a booklet by Dr. Henderson entitled "Cradle of Liberty," which I plan to put into the hands of each Member of Congress. The book is the latest work on the Mecklenburg Declaration and is a fine account of that historic event.

Today, Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate the five resolves of the Mecklenburg Declaration. They contain stirring words, and reflect the hopes and dreams of a freedom-loving people. In every sense of the word, they speak for themselves.

The Mecklenburg Declaration reads as follows:

1. That whosoever directly or indirectly abetted, or in any way, form, or manner, countenanced the unchartered and dangerous invasion of our rights, as claimed by Great Britain is an enemy to this country, to America, and to the inherent and inalienable rights of man.

2. We, the citizens of Mecklenburg County, do hereby dissolve the political bands which have connected us to the mother country, and hereby absolve ourselves from all allegiance to the British Crown, and abjure all political connection, contract, or association with that nation, who have wantonly trampled on our rights and liberties—and inhumanly shed the innocent blood of American patriots at Lexington.

3. We do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people, are, and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing association, under the control of no power other than that of our God and the general government of the Congress to the maintenance of which independence, civil and religious, we solemnly pledge to each other, our mutual cooperation, our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honor.

4. As we now acknowledge the existence and control of no law or legal officer, civil or military, within this county. We do hereby ordain and adopt, as rules of life, all, each, and every of our former laws—wherein, nevertheless, the Crown of Great Britain never can be considered as holding rights, privileges, immunities, or authority therein.

5. It is also further decreed that all, each, and every militia officer in this county is hereby reinstated in his former command and authority; he acting conformable to these regulations. And also, that every member present of this delegation, shall henceforth be a civil officer, viz a justice of the peace in the character of a committeeman to preserve peace, union, and harmony in said county and to use every exertion to

spread the love of country and fire of freedom throughout America, until a more general organized government be established in the province.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to commend my distinguished colleague for calling the attention of the Senate to the historic fact that the people of Mecklenburg County in North Carolina declared themselves to be free and independent of England long before the National Declaration of Independence was written.

MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that we note the death of Mary McLeod Bethune, a woman whose outstanding ability and warm sense of humanity have contributed so much to our country.

Dr. Bethune was the founder of the National Council of Negro Women and served for many years as its president. She was also a cofounder and president of Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Fla. Her public service included the directorship of the Division of Negro Affairs in the National Youth Administration and special adviser to the President on minority affairs. She also served as a consultant to the American delegation at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. Among her many other activities, Dr. Bethune made an outstanding contribution as vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

But a simple recounting of her many offices does not convey the full sense of Mary Bethune's forceful though gentle influence as educator, public servant, and inspirational leader. Anyone who ever heard her speak knows what vigor and understanding she brought to these undertakings. Her wisdom and strength of personality moved others to follow her example, and her guidance was always in the direction of tolerance and good will.

While her presence will no longer be felt among us, her work and her spirit remain. The story is told that when Dr. Bethune brought a benefactor around to the small shack in which she started her college he asked, "Where is this school of which you wish me to be a trustee?" And Mary Bethune replied, "In my mind and in my soul." That is where Mary McLeod Bethune continues to live—in our minds and in our souls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news item datelined Daytona Beach, Fla., May 18, concerning the death of Dr. Bethune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARY BETHUNE, 79, EDUCATOR, IS DEAD—FOUNDER AND EX-PRESIDENT OF BETHUNE-COOKMAN COLLEGE AIDED MANY UNITED STATES AGENCIES

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., May 18.—Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, president emeritus and cofounder of Bethune-Cookman College here, died Wednesday night at her home of a heart attack. She was 79 years old.

She was president of Bethune-Cookman College from its founding in 1904 to 1942.

During the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt the educator was director of the Division of Negro Affairs in the National Youth Administration and special adviser to the President on minority affairs.

In World War II she was special assistant to the Secretary of War for selection of the first officers candidate schools for WACs.

AIDED INTERRACIAL GOODWILL

Dr. Bethune had been called "one of the most potent factors in the growth of interracial good will in America." She was considered a dynamic speaker.

She was born at Mayesville, S. C., a daughter of Samuel and Mrs. Patsy McIntosh McLeod, and graduated from Scotia Seminary, Concord, N. C., and Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. Dr. Bethune won in 1910 an honorary A. M. from the State College at Orangeburg, S. C., and also held degrees from many other educational institutions, including Humanities and Science Doctorates, the latter from Tuskegee Institute.

The educator started her career in 1897 as an instructor at Haines Institute, Augusta, Ga., and served in the same capacity at the Palatka (Fla.) Mission School from 1899 to 1903. In 1904 she founded the Daytona Normal and Industrial School for Girls (now Bethune-Cookman College).

At its founding the college consisted of a tiny house in a lot used for dumping, where five little girls used ink made from elderberry juice and charcoal for pencils. Last year's enrollment was 794 students, with a faculty of 42.

STARTED WITH \$1.50

At the outset Dr. Bethune had \$1.50. To obtain more funds, she went from door to door selling fried fish and sweet potato pies. She invited James N. Gamble, son of the founder of Procter & Gamble, who had a winter home in Daytona Beach, to visit the place.

When Mr. Gamble looked at the shack he asked: "Where is this school of which you wish me to be a trustee?"

"In my mind," she said. "And my soul."

He gave her financial aid, became chairman of the schoolboard, and was credited by Dr. Bethune with having greatly aided in the school's development.

Dr. Bethune was associate consultant to the American delegation at the original United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

Several stories were told of persons who tried to humiliate Dr. Bethune by calling her "Auntie." She always replied with great solemnity, "Which one of my sister's children are you?" She was a close friend of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and served as former President Truman's personal representative at a presidential inauguration in Liberia.

BELONG TO NEA

The National Educational Association, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, the International Council of Women of Darker Races, and the National Council of Church Women were among other groups of which Dr. Bethune had been an official and member.

Dr. Bethune founded the National Council of Negro Women and served for many years as its president. A vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, she was one of that organization's outstanding figures.

She also served as vice president of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation of the National Urban League.

The educator won the Spingarn medal and the Francis A. Drexel award for her services to the Negro race. Many other awards and medals, including the Haitian Medal of Honor, were also bestowed upon her.

She was married in 1899 to Albert Bethune. He died in 1919. They had a son, Albert.

ALLEGED ATTEMPT ON PART OF OIL AND GAS INTERESTS TO INFLUENCE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask permission to speak briefly to draw to the attention of the Senate a new and scurrilous and slanderous attempt to influence a subcommittee of the Senate by the oil and gas interests of this country.

On Wednesday last, when Mr. James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel of the city of Detroit, was beginning to give his testimony before the subcommittee holding hearings on the natural-gas bill, a slanderous mimeographed sheet was circulated at that moment in the committee room. It bore the notation at its top: "From Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association," and was circulated by a man who later described himself as an employee of that group.

Mr. Lee has been for many years a highly respected public servant in Detroit. He has earned his high place in the affections and esteem of the people of my home city by his dedicated and effective service in their behalf. I doubt if there is another man in the field of relations between a city and its utilities of his stature in these United States. For almost half a century he has spoken out for the people of Detroit and of Michigan, and he has spoken effectively and always in the highest traditions of honor.

Yet this scandal sheet, financed no doubt from the million-and-a-half-dollar slush fund the oil and gas people have thrown into this fight as a preliminary installment on the tens of millions of dollars they are prepared to spend to gain their immoral ends, accused Jimmy Lee of being "an unwitting victim of Fabian Socialist tactics." The statement was made by Mr. R. F. Windfohr, head of the oil and gas lobby.

It is slanderous on two counts: First, that Mr. Lee, an attorney of national stature, is "unwitting" in his considered opposition to the bill which proposes to give the natural gas interests a blank check to raid the bank accounts of the gas consumers of the Nation; and, second, that Mr. Lee's opposition to the bill is some sort of a socialistic tactic. On just what grounds Mr. Windfohr in his windy eloquence reaches this conclusion I do not quite know, but anyway that is what the mimeographed scandal sheet says.

The sheet, I submit, was an attempt to influence the subcommittee improperly. I am told that this invasion of the senatorial dignity is something new. I say it is something very bad.

Let me quote a little further from Mr. Windfohr's remarks. He wrote:

Mr. Lee, in his testimony * * * apparently swallows whole the salami tactics by which socialism has been sold to many European countries—slice by slice.

I will leave it to the good judgment of my colleagues and of the American people if this is not a sly attempt to put a sinister, an alien, overtone into the present controversy.

The oil and gas association, trying to bolster a bad case, is attempting to con-

fuse the subcommittee and the American people by these tactics. I fear we are heading to a new low in attempts to influence deliberations of Members of the United States Senate in a matter in which a few great corporations are attempting to extract hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of unearned increment from the consumers of our country.

THE ABERDEEN ANGUS CALF PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday two distinguished citizens of Texas, the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, presented to the President of the United States an Aberdeen Angus calf. They expressed the hope that the President would soon give the calf his own personal care and attention.

I understand that a survey of the White House grounds shows that there is sufficient grass on the grounds to support this beautiful Texas heifer in a manner not usually enjoyed by Aberdeen Angus calves, but in a manner which the distinguished sons of Texas would certainly like this soon-to-be famous calf to enjoy.

Therefore it seems for the next 5 years at least the calf will not only be cared for in a manner not usually enjoyed by an Aberdeen Angus calf but will also be where she can receive the personal attention of the President.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the able Senator from Vermont. As an Aberdeen-Angus breeder in Tennessee, I admire the breed. I am a lover of animals. Since it would appear that there is room on the White House grounds for only one calf, I believe it would be cruelty to the animal to leave the calf there all by herself.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume the Senator from Tennessee has in mind the \$4,000 gentleman calf which is soon to find a home on the rolling pastures owned by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Since the Senator has brought up that point, I would be happy to supply the young lady with gentleman companionship.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the worst that can be said is that it was thoughtless and an oversight on the part of the distinguished gentlemen from Texas in giving the President only a heifer.

Mr. GORE. I wish to compliment those distinguished citizens of Texas in recognizing a great breed of cattle. I venture to offer to each of them a young male from my herd who will give lustrous black coats to the calves of those critters on their ranches down in Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee is indeed an expert on cattle. He knows the cattle business very well, particularly the Aberdeen-Angus breed. I should like to ask him a question. How long is a calf a calf? Would this calf be a calf in 1956, or would it by that time

have become something else and be in a different category.

Mr. GORE. With proper care she might be more than a calf by then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator feel that the White House grounds under a Republican administration are sufficiently lush to make that calf a little more than a calf by 1956?

Mr. GORE. I believe that by natural processes it would be more than a calf by 1956 and would be extremely lonesome all alone on the White House lawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Vermont said that he had had the White House lawn measured and found that it would support the calf. I was wondering whether after 1956 this fine specie of beef cattle which has been presented to the President would have outgrown the facilities of the White House lawn and that it might have to go to Gettysburg.

Mr. GORE. There might be other reasons for which it would have to go to Gettysburg.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee has convinced me that that is where it belongs.

Mr. GORE. A migration entirely involuntary might be underway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator does not believe that the calf might wish to go to Texas, does he?

Mr. GORE. Of course, the calf might not be all alone in that Gettysburg migration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if morning business has been concluded, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that I hope the Senate may be able to sit rather late next week, perhaps to 7, 7:30, or even 8 o'clock in the evening, during the consideration of the road bill. In addition, some conference reports may be ready for consideration by the Senate. Among them will be the conference report on the foreign-trade bill and on the Interior Department appropriations bill. I want Senators to be on notice that the conference reports will receive prompt consideration by the Senate.

On Tuesday about 4 hours will be taken for the consideration of the President's veto message on the postal-pay bill. So far as our plans are now made, we shall

continue with the consideration of the unfinished business, the road bill, throughout the week until a vote on it is reached. I hope that Senators who plan to speak on that measure will take note of this information and prepare their statements. I hope that the Senate may be able to reach a decision on the road bill before the end of next week.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before the Senate gets down to the pending business, which is the bill to extend the Federal Aid to Highways Act, I should like to make a few remarks to the Senate by way of background and perhaps to outline to the Senate what may be coming up in the debate.

Since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works in 1948, the committee has brought to the Senate four bills proposing extensions of the Federal Aid to Highways Act. Of the four, I believe the one before us today has been the most carefully prepared and the one most geared to the conditions of tomorrow as well as of today. For instance, this year the committee proposes to establish the Federal aid to highways program on a 5-year basis instead of the customary 2 years. We do this so that we can have a firm and continuing highway program in the Nation. We do this so that the States may have a firm long commitment with which to plan and construct. This is one of the modernizing features the Senators will find in Senate bill 1048.

I would be remiss if I did not tell the Senate that the members of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works have done a magnificent job. In particular, a very fine job was done by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. For 21 days the subcommittee listened to witnesses and took enough testimony to make 1,072 pages in the hearings. I say, advisedly, that the committee heard much advice and carefully prepared its recommendations to the Senate. What we bring to the Senate today is not merely another Federal-aid-to-highways bill. It is not merely another bill to continue a program which has expired. It is a pioneering act in the field of highways and roads designed to chart a new Federal policy and an entirely new concept of highway construction.

One of the things the committee had to determine before submitting its recommendations to the Senate was how serious is the need for accelerated construction on the present 40,000 miles of interstate highways. The committee decided that the Nation is behind the times so far as interstate highways are concerned, and, accordingly, the Senate will find a new emphasis on this system in the bill.

I do not presume, on the Senate's time, to go into all the features of the bill. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is well informed and well prepared, and the members of the subcommittee are equally so, on the various aspects of the bill. I know of several members of the full committee who faithfully attended the hearings although they are not members of the Roads Subcommittee, and I dare say they are equally as well prepared.

I believe many Senators know that both in the hearings and in executive sessions the committee had to face the question of financing the program. The committee looked at one plan which called for the borrowing of \$20 billion for a 10-year construction program. There was no doubt in the committee's mind that \$20 billion would have built and rebuilt many, many miles of roads, but the committee was also concerned that such a proposal would have required the \$20 billion to be paid back over a period of 30 years. This meant that after the 10-year building program had been completed we would still be in hock in the succeeding 20 years. The committee wondered what we might do with building highways and financing them during that 20-year period. It occurred to some of us that this would be heavy borrowing. I say "heavy," because we would have to pay nearly \$11½ billion in interest on the borrowed money. This meant we would lose \$1 out of every \$3 for construction. The committee felt that if the highway program was really pressing, 100 cents worth of construction should be obtained for every dollar expended. I understood it was proposed that all the proceeds of the highway gasoline tax would go to pay off the \$30½ billion which would be involved. This meant, of course, that the idea of no additional debt or revenue was absurd if we earmarked now all the highway gasoline tax for 30 years. In that event we would have to find a new source of revenue at the end of 10 years or stop all Federal aid entirely for the succeeding 20 years. The committee preferred to pay as you go. This matter will be more fully discussed by the junior Senator from Tennessee.

This is only one of the many problems we had to face. There is a growing national problem with which Senators and Members of the House have flirted from time to time. Many of the States have also flirted with the problem. Some Members of the Senate began to feel that the States had gone a little far with their flirtation and married the taxpayer's dollar to a destructive force. The problem to which I refer is the growing size and weight of vehicles traveling roads built to passenger-car standards. Different States for years have been conducting tests to learn what damage and wear oversized vehicles cause to our highways. During the hearings the committee was shown some pictures and some tests as to the damage done in the State of Maryland, in the nearby area, by overloaded trucks.

The various State highway departments have long been aware of this destructive force. In fact, the American Association of State Highway Officials, which is made up of the State highway

engineers and State highway commissioners and highway bodies of the States, have prescribed standards of vehicle sizes and weights and most States respect them. In several cases, however, including my own State of New Mexico, the sizes of commercial vehicles have been steadily increased.

The committee thought this was the time to recognize the exhaustive tests conducted in Maryland and Idaho and the conclusive findings gleaned from those tests and try to establish a firm national policy for the highways on which taxpayers' money is used.

We are not trying to be arbitrary and we are not acting hastily. But the committee has become concerned with what we think is an accelerated practice and we felt the Congress should declare a policy with the idea of making the highway money go as far as it can and to bring this national problem somewhere into line and to establish some kind of uniformity. We do not presume to invade States' rights or to tell the States what to do. As a matter of fact, all the committee is doing in this bill is recognizing and making firm the policy the States have already recommended to the Bureau of Public Roads and to the Congress itself. This again is another problem I will leave to members of the committee for further discussion.

We have incorporated into the highway bill another feature which has been made a part of so many Federal construction laws in recent years. I refer to the Davis-Bacon Act. The committee proposes that where Federal money is used for highway construction in the interstate system the contractors be protected in one sense and that the workingman be protected in another.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that under this bill as it concerns the interstate system, the American taxpayer is going to pay 90 cents out of every dollar.

The committee recommends to the Senate the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provisions. I believe a more complete justification and discussion of this will be made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I should like to say to the Senate that I think the Davis-Bacon provisions would be most helpful to the States. When we put the Davis-Bacon provision into the law, we insured against Federal money being used to depress wages in an area. It simply means that a less conscientious and perhaps more unscrupulous contractor cannot move into an area and through his contract create local pressure for lower wages. In each of the States there are large groups of men of integrity and ability who 12 months a year regularly carry forward our highway programs. These contractors have regular crews and we know the kind of work they do and that we can depend upon them. I think these men are entitled to some protection.

The committee has established a new matching formula for the special interstate highway system. It is proposed that the Federal Government pay 90 percent of the cost, with the States paying 10 percent. This seemed to be generally desired by the States and by the President. We did not accept all the

recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Roads, although, of course, the findings of that advisory committee were known to us. We objected seriously to one feature of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, and that was the one which would have frozen the construction level of farm-to-market roads and urban developments at their present level. The freeze would have lasted for 30 years. I am quite sure that the Senators know that our farm-to-market program is still growing, and we cannot shut it off at this point.

Senate bill 1048 provides the following construction program authorization:

First. Four hundred million dollars for the primary system, which is a part of the interstate system; \$300 million for the secondary system; and \$200 million for the urban system for the fiscal years 1957 through 1961.

Second. It provides \$1 billion for fiscal year 1957; \$1,250 billion for fiscal year 1958; \$1.5 billion for the fiscal year 1959; \$2 billion for fiscal year 1960; and \$2 billion for fiscal year 1961 for the interstate system.

Third. It provides \$22 million for forest highways for fiscal year 1958 through 1961 and \$24 million for forest development roads and trails for the same period.

Fourth. It provides \$12 million for construction, reconstruction, and improvements of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks, monuments, and so forth, for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961.

Fifth. It provides \$11 million for construction and maintenance of parkways for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961.

Sixth. It provides \$10 million for construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges for Indian lands and reservations for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961.

Seventh. It authorizes \$2 million for the completion of sections of important Federal-aid highways lying entirely within the public domain for each of the fiscal years 1956 through 1961.

Eighth. And it would grant the Secretary of Commerce contractual authority to acquire rights-of-way for Federal-aid highway projects in the amount of \$100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

In all, Senate bill 1048 would provide a grand total of \$7,750,000,000 for the interstate highway system; \$4½ billion for the primary, secondary, and urban systems; and \$405 million for forest highways, forest development, roads and trails, and lesser roads on Government lands, over a 5-year period.

Mr. President, this is the only statement I wish to make at this particular time, unless there are some questions to be asked.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, has just outlined in a summary way the provisions of Senate bill 1048. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico was very generous in his references to the work of and the part which the junior Senator from Tennessee played in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to work with my colleagues on the Public Works Committee in the drafting of this Federal highway bill, S. 1048. The experience has been not only enjoyable, but enlightening and encouraging.

After long public hearings, which began on February 21, followed by extended executive sessions involving careful, detailed examination and differing opinions, our committee sessions ended with utmost good fellowship and genuine mutual regard. I am grateful for the opportunity I have had to work with this group of great Senators and distinguished gentlemen. Not only to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the committee, but to other Senators, too, am I grateful—the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], ranking minority member, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I shall ever be grateful for their patience and understanding in moments of trial and strain.

Our public hearings were exhaustive of the subject matter under consideration. We accorded all who desired to be heard an opportunity to appear before the committee. Each member of the committee was invited to suggest additional helpful witnesses who they thought might prove of aid. Every such suggestion was followed. So, I believe, Mr. President, that we had not only a full hearing, but an entirely fair public hearing.

Then, in executive session the entire bill was read, word for word, line for line. Many amendments were offered. Some were rejected; others accepted. Through all this, encompassing several weeks, never an unkind word, never an intolerant or even an impatient expression was heard. Though arduous, this has been a joyful work. So you can see, Mr. President, that though this work has been arduous, it has really been a work of joy. I am proud of the record of comradery, mutual respect, and esteem we have established. I am proud, too, Mr. President, of our handiwork.

The bill, which was finally reported from the committee, is truly a committee bill. Every member contributed to its drafting. Even the members who were finally conscientiously unable to vote to report the bill from committee contrib-

uted very substantially to the drafting of the final version.

I acknowledge that perhaps no Member was more often on the losing side, so far as amendments were concerned, than I. Though the basic framework of the bill remains, it has been materially changed and amended as a result of committee consideration and action. This is as it should be, Mr. President. A group of men can bring to bear upon a subject not only more wisdom than can one man, but a greater representation of the viewpoints of the various sections and areas of this great country, and also a greater diversity of needs.

Senate bill 1048 then, as I have said, is truly the product of group action. I think the bill embodies principles that are basically sound, principles which for the most part have been tested in a crucible of experience.

The committee became convinced that the national need for a vigorous highway improvement program was urgent. We believe that there is tremendous public interest in the development of a highway program to meet the requirements of national defense and the needs of our expanding economy.

It is obvious that our existing highways are inadequate to meet the demands of today, to say nothing of the future. Although overall expenditures for highway construction have increased consistently since World War II, we have been unable even to maintain the status quo.

We have been losing ground, Mr. President. In other words, highway deterioration has been more rapid than have been highway improvements. Little or no progress has been made in overcoming existing and prospective deficiencies caused by a constant increase in the volume of traffic and in the size and speed of the vehicles using the Nation's highways.

The increased volume of traffic is not something about which we should be fearful. The volume of motor vehicle traffic is an index to the prosperity and economic activity of the country. As the country grows, as our national economy expands, so will motor-vehicle traffic.

The committee feels that our national economic development will be seriously impaired unless our highway system—and I mean by this all our Federal-aid highway systems—is brought to a state of adequacy.

The constant death toll on our highways is appalling. It amounts to approximately 36,000 persons every year; and many, many thousands more are maimed and crippled. In addition, there is a loss of property and a loss of time from slowed-up traffic. To meet this challenge, bold action on the part of the Nation and on the part of the 48 States is required.

Mr. President, I feel indebted to President Eisenhower and to Gen. Lucius Clay for their fine contribution in dramatizing this need and in alerting Congress and the Nation to the urgency of making provision for our present highway deficiencies and for those which are in prospect.

The members of the Clay committee served, I am informed, without salary and, in some cases, without even reimbursement of expenses. All American should be grateful for the selfless efforts and magnificent contribution of General Clay and his committee. The Clay committee report and the President's message to the Congress had a profound impact not only upon your committee, but upon the country. I think it fair to say that without the President's message and the work of the Clay committee, the Congress would not have considered major highway legislation during this present session.

As the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has pointed out, we have traditionally enacted highway legislation on a biennial basis. The fact that the Senate Committee on Public Works has found unacceptable the proposed legislation recommended by President Eisenhower and General Clay should not detract from the fine public service they have rendered in this regard.

Mr. President, deeply impressed as we were, with the urgent need for a vigorous highway-improvement program, your committee has undertaken to develop a sound, constructive program which will meet the national need for better highways. We sincerely believe we have done so. At least we have tried earnestly.

The committee bill preserves and builds upon the national relationship between the Bureau of Public Roads and the various State highway departments. This relationship has been forged through years of experience and successful cooperation. We have preserved, too, the apportionment principle by which each State can be assured in advance of the amount of funds available to it. We have recommended the authorization of additional Federal funds to improve all our system of Federal-aid highways—interstate, primary, urban, and farm to market, sometimes called secondary. Your committee regards Senate bill 1048 as the embodiment of a balanced highway-improvement program, a fair program, a sound program, a constructive program, commensurate with national needs.

In the 1954 Highway Act, Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a comprehensive study, and to report to the Congress on the cost of completing all our roads and streets to standards adequate to meet our needs. The Secretary submitted this report on March 25, 1955. The contents of the report had, in the main, previously been available to General Clay and his committee; and he made generous reference to it in his report. It was published as House Document No. 120, 84th Congress. This study was the most exhaustive of its type ever made. Some of the estimates, as the Clay committee points out, may be overly optimistic. Some of the estimates may be lower than a realistic appraisal would indicate. But the report was exhaustive. It was essentially a compilation of the needs table and requirements submitted by the various State highway departments. Its conclusions were staggering. The Secretary

reported that to bring all our roads and streets to a desired state of completion would require the expenditure of \$101 billion during a period of 10 years.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss for a moment the figure to which I have referred, namely, \$101 billion. I believe that figure has caused more confusion about proposed highway legislation than has any other single factor. The Clay committee had before it the figures Secretary Weeks subsequently supplied to our committee. In its report the Clay committee cited the compelling need, and offered certain recommendations for a solution of a part of the problem. From the very outset the figure \$101 billion has been misunderstood. It has frequently been used in connection with the phrase "grand plan"; and certain proposals growing out of the Clay committee report have become known as the \$101 billion highway program, when, in fact, the proposals in question constituted nothing of the sort.

In brief, Mr. President, the sum \$101 billion is the estimated amount which would be spent by all levels of government—Federal, State, local, county, and municipal—if all our highways, roads, trails, and city streets were to be completed to adequate standards in 10 years. There never has been a proposal that any such sum be spent by the Federal Government, nor has there been a proposal that any such sum be spent by both Federal and State Governments on the highways known as Federal-aid highways. Furthermore, Mr. President, insofar as I know, no one has proposed a plan under which it would be guaranteed that \$101 billion would be available within the next 10 years from all sources or from any source, nor has there been advanced any plan which would assure that these desirable objectives would be achieved.

At this point I wish to compliment the members of the executive branch for their cooperation with the committee in its deliberations. The Bureau of Public Roads, the Secretary of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, in fact, all the agencies from which the committee requested information and cooperation, have supplied them in full measure.

I wish particularly to express my appreciation to Mr. C. D. Curtis, Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, and to Mr. Francis V. du Pont, former Commissioner, who now is consultant to the Secretary of Commerce, for their untiring and very generous assistance to our committee.

The bill reported by the committee authorizes a program whose magnitude has perhaps been unequalled in our history, with the exception of programs for the prosecution of war and measures for the preservation of the national security. It received the most searching examination in committee. It deserves equally careful consideration by all Members of the Senate. I have the feeling that its full significance may not yet have been fully realized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend, with whom I served in the other body, and also on

committees of the other body. He has contributed greatly to the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. The kindness of the Senator's remarks in yielding almost makes it embarrassing to me to say what I was about to say.

Mr. GORE. That was not the purpose of the kindness.

Mr. COTTON. One might be led to think that this exchange has been rehearsed, which, of course, is not the case.

However, I wished to interrupt the Senator for a moment at this time to say that his remarks so far have been characteristically fair and generous on his part. The credit which he has given to the executive department, to the President, and to the Clay committee is typical of the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

As one of the minority members of the committee who were unable to go along with the majority, I wish the RECORD to show—and my colleagues feel the same way—that no one could have been more fair and generous than the distinguished Senator from Tennessee or the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the full committee, in dealing with an extremely difficult and complicated problem.

Full opportunity was afforded for the expression of opinions of all members of the subcommittee, and we would like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the fine, fair, able, and masterly way in which he conducted all the hearings and all the proceedings in the subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the generosity of the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire is overwhelming. Were not one word of the proposed legislation ever to find its way into laws, the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague would be ample compensation for the weeks of labor. I thank him very sincerely.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I would not want my remarks at this point, as the only other Republican in the Chamber, to indicate any possible disagreement with the excellent comments made by our distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I have in mind making some remarks of a similar nature on my own time a little later, but until then I wish to associate myself completely with what the junior Senator from New Hampshire has said concerning the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and other Senators.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, silence on the part of the senior Senator from Connecticut is never indicative of anything. Still water runs deep.

I thank my able friend. It does not come as a surprise that he feels kindly toward me. I recall that during our first year in this body we had a minor clash or two. Out of those clashes came what I believe is truly a mutual respect, esteem, and affection. It is fully shared by me. I do not think any single member of the subcommittee, with the possible exception of the chairman, attended

more sessions of the committee than did the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut. He contributed magnificently to the bill which is now before the Senate.

Of course, it is a matter of regret that all of us cannot unanimously support the bill. But, Mr. President, that is not to be expected in the case of a bill of such magnitude as this.

As I have just said, perhaps no bill in the history of the Congress, other than those dealing with war for the preservation of the country, has encompassed a program of the magnitude envisioned in the pending bill. Therefore, it is not strange that there should be differences of opinion. Such differences of opinion are sincerely held. I wish to say, for the world to know, that even though some Members of the minority were finally unable to support the bill, they did not let that deter them one iota from contributing, in the masterly fashion in which they have contributed, toward the final result; and their contribution was great.

The committee concluded, on the basis of the evidence before it, that the question of the necessity for such a program is no longer at issue. We came to the unanimous conclusion that the need was great, and that it was urgent. Though no formal vote was taken, I believe it is fair to say that on the question of need, the committee was unanimous. I believe that a record vote on that question would have been unanimous.

Having agreed upon the necessity for an accelerated program, there remained before the committee the task of perfecting a bill best designed to discharge the Federal Government's responsibility in the field of highway construction.

Essentially, we were faced with the problem of deciding how much money should be authorized, how it should be allocated and how the program should be administered. On these questions, or some of them, there was a difference of opinion among members of the committee, as is reflected in the filing of minority views and individual views. In fact, I will say to my distinguished friend from Connecticut that he and I voted differently on certain amendments which are in the bill. There are a number of amendments in the bill for which he voted and against which I voted. As I previously stated, the bill is the product of the work of 13 men. I thank the Senator from Connecticut very genuinely for his generosity.

The committee had before it two basically conflicting methods of approach, both sincerely advocated. The first involved retention of the basic framework of our existing program with increased authorizations to meet the need and with appropriate modifications designed to insure a dollar's worth of road for every dollar of the taxpayer's money. The second method involved a radical departure from the existing program with drastic changes in emphasis and with what appeared to me to be a highly unorthodox approach to the problems of financing and administration. I acknowledge that it did not appear to some members of the committee to be an orthodox approach. That was one of the

points on which there was a difference of opinion.

The majority of the committee concluded that our existing program is basically sound. It permits maximum flexibility to meet the varying needs of States, at the same time permitting coordination at the national level so as to insure proper integration of our highway network and the maintenance of adequate standards of construction. The apportionment formulas, that is, the formulas by which Federal highway funds are apportioned to the respective States as developed over the years, insure equitable distribution of Federal funds, as Congress interprets equitable distribution. Only last year we made some modification of the apportionment formula with respect to interstate highways. It may well be that it will require additional modification. I point out to my colleagues from New Hampshire and Connecticut that it was I who cast the deciding vote last year in the Public Works Committee to give added emphasis in the apportionment formula to population. Furthermore, under this program, the people, through their representatives in the Congress, retain full control of the highway program and the expenditure of Federal funds.

It may well be that as we progress with this program we shall need to review again the apportionment formula and give still more emphasis to the concentration of population. Essentially, the biggest traffic patterns appear where the most people live. Of course, there are circumstances which affect and modify that situation, such as the location of industry and the volume of through traffic from one production center to another.

Under this program, the people, through their representatives in Congress, retain full control of the highway program and the expenditure of Federal funds.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss in detail the provisions of S. 1160, known as the administration's highway bill. I daresay that further reference to it will be made before the debate is concluded. I believe it has been said that the administration bill will later be offered as an amendment. Therefore, it can then be debated at length. The majority of the committee was unable to accept the philosophy of that bill.

Mr. President, I should now like to make brief reference to S. 1160. That bill proposed that Federal contributions to the construction of primary, secondary, and urban segments of our Federal-aid system be frozen at a level of \$100 million less than that provided by existing authorizations. The same amounts were permitted to stand for primary and secondary roads. That is, the amounts contained in the present law were permitted to remain for secondary roads and for primary roads. However, the authorization for urban highways was reduced by the administration bill by \$100 million from its present level. The bill proposed that the entire amount of increased Federal aid be concentrated on the national system of interstate highways. The com-

mittee was disturbed by the feature of the plan which provided for the expenditure within 10 years of all the increased funds expected to be available for a period extending for at least 30 years. I refer to the funds expected to be available from fuel and lubricating-oil taxes.

Efforts on the part of the committee to elicit information as to the source of funds for improvement and extension of the interstate system after the passage of 10 years brought only the answer: "That is something that will have to be determined at that time." No specific apportionment of these funds to the States was contemplated. In fact, the apportionment formula for the interstate system would be repealed.

The expenditure of these funds was to be subject to such annual allocations as might be made periodically by the Secretary of Commerce. The majority of the committee concluded that such a program would inevitably lead to further deterioration of our primary, urban, and farm-to-market roads, which are so vital to our economy.

Still more disturbing to the committee was the method of financing suggested by S. 1160. An ingenious corporate device was proposed. This Federal corporation would be authorized to borrow money which somehow would not be national debt. It was said that the corporate bonds would be self-liquidating, yet the corporation would have no assets and no source of funds other than an indefinite appropriation at the hands of the Congress from the general revenues of the United States Treasury.

While the committee did not accept the method of approach outlined by S. 1160, there are a number of similar features in that bill and in S. 1048, the bill reported by the committee.

I say in all fairness that not only did the members of the executive branch—the President and General Clay—make a contribution to the proposed legislation now before the Senate, but the terms of S. 1160 were used in a constructive manner in developing this program. I know that I offered, as an amendment to the bill which I introduced, almost verbatim the right-of-way acquisition authority for the Secretary of Commerce as it was proposed in S. 1160. That amendment was adopted by the committee.

It might be helpful to some if the points of similarity and the points of difference between the two bills were briefly stated. In the hope that it will contribute to careful consideration, I shall now do so.

The two bills—S. 1048 and S. 1160—contain the following similar provisions:

A. The present 50-50 matching formula for primary, urban, and secondary highway projects is continued in both bills.

B. Both bills contain provisions authorizing the Federal Government to acquire highway rights-of-way when requested to do so by a State.

C. Both bills authorize greatly increased Federal expenditures for highway improvement.

D. In total amounts the 2 bills are roughly comparable, if a 10-year period is assumed for both.

E. Neither bill provides any additional revenue.

F. Neither bill has self-liquidating features, except as additional revenue will be realized from greater fuel consumption on better roads. This is inherent and substantial.

G. Both bills place major emphasis on construction of a national system of interstate highways.

Having pointed out a number of similarities between the 2 bills, I should like to list a few of the differing points of view embodied in the 2 bills.

Principal points of difference between the committee bill and the administration bill are as follows:

First. The committee bill provides increased funds for the construction and improvement of all types of Federal-aid highways.

The administration bill would place every single dollar of additional aid on the interstate highways, which, important though they are, carry only one-seventh of the traffic.

Second. The committee bill continues the apportionment formula in existing law by which each State is assured its pro rata part.

The administration bill proposes to abolish the apportionment formula and leave to the Secretary of Commerce the decision as to where, when, how, and in what amounts all funds would be spent on the interstate highways.

Third. The committee bill proposes to finance highway construction by annual appropriations from Congress, as provided by existing law.

The administration bill is an indefinite appropriation bill, proposing to appropriate an indefinite amount for an indefinite time, a minimum of 30 years, to a highway corporation, the members of which would serve without term and at the will of the President.

Fourth. Under the committee bill, if it is necessary to sell bonds to finance a highway improvement program, the taxpayers will have the advantage of the lowest possible interest rate.

The administration bill proposes the issuance of special bonds in the sum of \$21 billion by the proposed Highway Corporation, said corporation being without assets or sources of revenue. These bonds, according to Secretary Humphrey, would sell at a rate of interest considerably higher than United States Government bonds.

Fifth. The committee bill provides a 90-10 matching basis for interstate highways.

The administration bill provides an approximate 95-5 matching basis for interstate highways.

I am not sure, Mr. President, that the 95-5 matching ratio is exactly correct, so I used the word "approximate." That is as near as it can be calculated by the staff of the committee.

There are certain additional provisions in the committee bill which are not contained in the administration bill some of which I wish to point out:

(a) A move to bring uniformity in vehicle weights and dimensions, as well as to place an effective stop sign against unreasonable increases in weights and sizes of trucks and buses.

(b) Some limited authority to combat obstructive and dangerous advertising along highway rights-of-way.

(c) Extends the Davis-Bacon Act to interstate highway projects in which the Federal Government, under the committee bill, would make the principal investment. The bill does not extend the act to primary, secondary, or urban projects.

So, Mr. President, I have indicated a number of points of similarity and a number of points of difference between the two bills. I have also mentioned some provisions contained in the committee bill which are not contained in the administration bill. I would not claim that I have listed every single item of similarity, or disparity, or all of the added provisions of the committee bill, but I think I have related the principal points of similarity, of difference, and the points of addition.

The bill reported by the committee proposes no major changes in the administration of the existing program. We think the present program has worked well over the years.

A detailed section-by-section analysis of the bill is contained in the committee report. It shall be my purpose to explain briefly the major provisions of the bill, and I shall be glad to undertake as best I can, to answer any questions which Senators may have about its phraseology.

Historically, highway authorizations have been enacted on a 2-year basis with sufficient lead time to permit apportionment of the funds and adequate planning and to afford the States an opportunity to take appropriate action to so arrange their finances as to be in a position to discharge their responsibilities under the program. The Highway Act of 1954 contained authorizations for fiscal 1956 and 1957. There was considerable evidence before the committee that authorizations for a longer period would permit better long-range planning, both by the Federal Government and by the States.

The funds authorized in the 1954 act will actually be used in building highways beginning on July 1 next. A highway system requires that much lead time. The funds were apportioned in June of last year. The States will start spending them on July 1 of this year. It takes time, Mr. President, for engineers to make designs for bridges and grades, and to make drawings and surveys for new highways, relocations, and improvements of existing highways. The committee felt there was some merit to extending the period from 2 years to 5 years. It was suggested that the construction industry and material suppliers would be in a better position to plan for an accelerated program if they were assured of a definite program extending for a period longer than 2 years. These arguments were persuasive to the committee.

Accordingly, the bill contains authorizations for 5 years. We considered extending the authorizations for 10 years but concluded that a 5-year period would provide a stable program and, at the same time, insure automatic review by the Congress with an opportunity to make such modifications and revisions as might appear advisable at that time.

In order to provide essential lead time for necessary planning, the accelerated program will begin in fiscal 1957.

The administration bill proposed a 10-year program. Members of the subcommittee considered amending S. 1048 and making it a 10-year program. However, the committee finally concluded that a longer-term program could be accomplished by writing into the bill a statement of policy and by placing in the report a statement of policy, a determination, expressing the sense of the Congress that it was the policy and purpose to bring all Federal-aid highways into a state of adequacy, a condition adequate to handle the traffic pattern of the future. But the committee felt that there was much to be said for having a 5-year program actually authorized, with the intention of having additional programs to follow. This would preserve to Congress, as I have said, the very valuable opportunity of making a necessary review of the program 3 or 4 years from now.

The bill authorizes the expenditure of approximately \$12¾ billion of Federal funds during the 5-year period. Of this amount, \$12¼ billion are authorized for projects on the Federal-aid system with participation by the States. The remainder is authorized for projects located in national forests, national parks, and other areas within the public domain upon which the Federal Government assumes the entire cost of highway construction.

In arriving at the amounts contained in the bill, the committee was guided by certain principles. It was cognizant of the fact that the Federal Government has a greater interest in and a greater responsibility for highways located on the interstate system. But, at the same time, we felt that any sound program must recognize the necessity for accelerated construction on all segments of the Federal-aid system, particularly since six-sevenths of the traffic is on the systems other than interstate.

Secondly, the committee concluded that a progressive increase in total authorizations would permit an orderly acceleration of the program without disrupting the construction industry to the extent of inflating the cost of highways.

We felt that we were limited by the availability of building materials and construction facilities. Representatives of the highway-construction and building-supplies industries testified before the committee.

A bill has been reported proposing the maximum amounts which the committee believed could be expended without inflating the cost of highway construction. Had the committee thought it advisable to recommend a more vigorous program than that which is contained in S. 1048, I am sure it would have done so. The sentiment in the committee, if I interpreted it correctly, was to act as fast and as energetically as we could, while still insuring the taxpayer of receiving a dollar's worth of road for his tax dollar.

The bill contains authorizations for Federal contributions to construction on the primary, secondary, and urban systems in the total amount of \$900 million

per year for each of the 5 years. This figure compares with \$700 million per year provided by existing law. The cost of projects on these systems will continue to be borne 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the State governments.

While the increases provided for the primary, secondary, and urban systems are substantial, by far the largest increase is provided for the interstate system. The existing authorization for exclusive use on the interstate highway system is \$175 million per year. The committee bill provides \$1 billion for fiscal 1957.

To illustrate how greatly and how vigorously the committee bill steps up the Federal expenditures on the national system of interstate highways, there is available for the present fiscal year \$25 million of Federal funds for interstate highways. The 1954 act, as I have said, raised that amount to \$175 million a year. I recall the debate in the Senate on that law. It was referred to as the biggest highway program in the history of the United States.

Those funds, as I have previously pointed out, will become available for expenditure on July 1 of this year.

What does S. 1048 provide? Not \$25 million; not \$175 million; but \$1 billion a year for the first year; \$1,250,000,000 for the second year; \$1,500,000,000 for the third year; and then, for the fourth and fifth years, \$2 billion each year.

Yet some persons say the amount is still inadequate. I believe sincerely that the bill contains about as much money as the United States Government can spend on highways in the next 5 years without disrupting the cost factor, not only of the construction facilities, but also cost of supplies.

In further recognition of the greater Federal responsibility for the interstate system and in recognition of the limitations on the ability of some of the States to provide matching funds, the Federal share of the cost of projects on the interstate system is increased to 90 percent, with State participation limited to 10 percent.

I should like to review briefly the history of that provision. Until the 1954 act the States were required to match all Federal-aid highway funds on a 50-50 basis. The interstate funds were treated according to the same matching formula as were the funds for primary, secondary, and urban highways.

Last year that formula was changed for the interstate system. The Federal share was raised to 60 percent, leaving 40 percent as the share to be paid by the States. There was a close contest in the Senate Committee on Public Works on that issue. The difference in the vote was only one. I voted to raise the Federal share to 60 percent.

When S. 1048 was originally introduced it authorized use of Federal funds for interstate highways to pay 66⅔ percent of the cost, while requiring the States to contribute only 33⅓ percent.

After long hearings, the committee became convinced that the national interest in the interstate highways was paramount. The subcommittee recommended an amendment providing that the

Federal Government should supply 75 percent of interstate highways funds, leaving 25 percent to be paid by the States.

The full committee considered the question further. After considering the ability of the States to match, in view of the necessities of the national economy and the national defense, the full committee felt that the early construction of the interstate highway system was so urgent that the matching formula was changed to a 90-10 percent basis.

I wish to say, in candor, that I believe the bill might still be a sounder one if the 75-25 percent basis had been retained.

I do not think it breaks any rule to say that is how I voted in the committee. However, Mr. President, I support the bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I stand here representing this product of the committee, which I declare to be good. There are other minor points in the bill as to which I found myself differing from the majority. But what of it? We did the best we could. The bill represents the composite thinking of the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate. I am proud, I repeat, of its handiwork.

It is perhaps interesting to note that in the fourth year of operation under the committee bill, the total Federal outlay on the Federal-aid system reaches two and nine-tenths billion per year. This is slightly less than the annual average of three and one-tenth billion proposed under S. 1160. The significant difference is that the committee bill, while emphasizing the interstate system, also provides increases in funds available for matching by the States for use on the primary, secondary, and urban systems. S. 1160, on the other hand, not only limited the authorization for these systems to an amount \$100 million less than that now authorized, but effectively forestalled any increase whatsoever in these authorizations at any time in the foreseeable future, if there was to be any relationship between revenue from fuel oil and lubricating oil taxes and the expenditures for highways.

The bill extends the various authorizations for projects on which the Federal Government bears the full cost of construction through fiscal 1961 to conform, in period of time, to the authorization for the Federal-aid systems. The amounts authorized are the same as those provided by existing law, except in the case of funds for projects on public lands as described in section 8 of the bill, which were increased from \$1 million per year to \$2 million per year.

In addition to providing increased authorization, the committee added several provisions to existing law which it believes will improve the program, I shall discuss these briefly in the order in which they appear in the bill. I shall do so in the hope that it will be of assistance to Members of the Senate, and to others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in considering this vital legislative proposal.

The committee has for some time been disturbed by continued increases in the weights and dimensions of vehicles operated over highways constructed in part with Federal funds. In many instances,

the size and weight of vehicles far exceed those for which our highways were designed. In such cases, rapid deterioration of the highways is inevitable. The committee did not feel that the Federal Government should seek to invade the jurisdiction of States in the exercise of their police power by entering the field of regulating or enforcing provisions relative to the size and weight of vehicles. It did feel, however, if the Federal Government was to enter into a vastly accelerated construction program, involving the payment of 90 percent of the cost of interstate projects, that, in the interest of preserving the taxpayers investment, some action to encourage the States to do a better job in this field is appropriate.

The States themselves have long recognized the desirability of uniformity of maximum weights and dimensions of motor vehicles. The American Association of State Highway Officials in 1946 adopted and published its policy in this matter, including desirable maximum weights and dimensions, and recommended that they be incorporated into State law. Many of the States have done so. In fact, some States have maximum weight and dimensional limitations which are lower than those recommended by the association. Unfortunately, however, some States have acted to permit sizes and weights in excess of the recommended standards, and in excess of the standards for design and construction even now recommended and endorsed by the Federal Bureau of Roads.

The committee did not feel that it was practicable to seek to encourage any State to roll back its laws in this respect. It was the sense of the committee, however, that some action should be taken to maintain the status quo—or, rather, to prevent further increases above the standards of design and construction of the highways to be built under this program.

To achieve this objective, the bill provides that apportionment of interstate funds shall be withheld from any State which permits the use of its highway by vehicles with weights or dimensions in excess of the larger of first, those permitted under State law in effect on May 1, 1955, or second, those recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials in their policy statement adopted in 1946. Under this provision, any State having laws imposing maximum weights or dimensions lower than the recommended standards will be free to raise them to the recommended standards. However, those States which now permit maximum weights or dimensions equal to, or in excess of, the recommended standards, cannot further increase them without jeopardizing their entitlement to interstate funds authorized by the bill.

The bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to proceed as expeditiously as possible with certain road tests now planned or in progress under the auspices of the Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials, and at the conclusion thereof to report to the Congress his recommendations on this subject. The committee feels that upon receipt of the Secretary's

report, the Congress will be in a position to appraise this matter further. In the meantime, the committee feels that this effort to restrain further increases in sizes and weights will have a salutary effect.

Mr. President, let me repeat: We are undertaking a program larger than any program ever inaugurated in the history of this Government other than those for the protection and preservation of the Republic under threat of war. We are undertaking a program to build expeditiously a national system of interstate highways in which the Federal Government will make the principal investment—90 percent. Since the Federal Government is to make the principal investment, the committee felt that the Congress not only had the right, but also the responsibility, to protect the people's investment in those highways.

The Bureau of Public Roads recommends the construction of highways to carry an axleload of 18,000 pounds. Mr. President, at this time, I shall not refer in detail to various other specific recommendations of the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway officials; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the maximum standards recommended by the State highway officials in their publication in 1946.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the recommendations was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Width: No vehicle, unladen or with load, shall have a total outside width in excess of 96 inches.

(NOTE.—It is recognized that certain conditions inherent in the design of vehicles suggest the desirability of 102 inches as a standard of maximum width. The existence of numerous bridges and a large mileage of highways too narrow for the safe accommodation of vehicles of such width precludes the present adoption of the higher standard of width. The State highway departments and Public Roads Administration are urged to give consideration to the desirability of eventual provision for the accommodation of vehicles 102 inches in width in planning the reconstruction of Federal-aid and State highways.)

2. Height: No vehicle, unladen or with load, shall exceed a height of 12 feet, 6 inches.

3. Length: (a) No single truck, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 35 feet.

(b) No single bus, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 40 feet, provided that a bus in excess of 35 feet in overall length shall not have less than 3 axles.

(c) No combination of truck-tractor and semitrailer, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 50 feet.

(d) No other combination of vehicles shall consist of more than 2 units, and no such combination of vehicles, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 60 feet.

4. Speed: (a) Minimum speed. No motor vehicles shall be unnecessarily driven at such slow speed as to impede or block the normal and reasonable movement of traffic. Exception to this requirement shall be recognized when reduced speed is necessary for safe operation or when a vehicle or combination of vehicles is necessarily or in compliance with

law or police direction proceeding at reduced speed.

(b) Maximum speed. No truck shall be operated at a speed greater than 45 miles per hour. Passenger vehicles may be operated at such speeds as shall be consistent at all times with safety and the proper use of the roads.

(c) Vehicles equipped with solid rubber or cushion tires shall be operated at a speed not in excess of 10 miles per hour.

5. Permissible loads: (a) No axle shall carry a load in excess of 18,000 pounds.

(NOTE.—An axle load shall be defined as the total load transmitted to the road by all wheels whose centers may be included between two parallel transverse vertical planes 40 inches apart, extending across the full width of the vehicle.)

(b) No group of axles shall carry a load in pounds in excess of the value given in the following table corresponding to the distance in feet between the extreme axles of the group, measured longitudinally to the nearest foot:

Maximum load in pounds carried on any group of axles

Distance in feet between the extremes of any group of axles:	
4.....	32,000
5.....	32,000
6.....	32,000
7.....	32,000
8.....	32,610
9.....	33,580
10.....	34,550
11.....	35,510
12.....	36,470
13.....	37,420
14.....	38,360
15.....	39,300
16.....	40,230
17.....	41,160
18.....	42,080
19.....	42,990
20.....	43,900
21.....	44,800
22.....	45,700
23.....	46,590
24.....	47,470
25.....	48,350
26.....	49,220
27.....	50,090
28.....	50,950
29.....	51,800
30.....	52,650
31.....	53,490
32.....	54,330
33.....	55,160
34.....	55,980
35.....	56,800
36.....	57,610
37.....	58,420
38.....	59,220
39.....	60,010
40.....	60,800
41.....	61,580
42.....	62,360
43.....	63,130
44.....	63,890
45.....	64,650
46.....	65,400
47.....	66,150
48.....	66,890
49.....	67,620
50.....	68,350
51.....	69,070
52.....	69,790
53.....	70,500
54.....	71,200
55.....	71,900
56.....	72,590
57.....	73,280

(c) The maximum axle and axle-group loads recommended in paragraphs (a) and (b) above are subject to reasonable reduction in the discretion of the appropriate highway authorities during periods when road subgrades have been weakened by water saturation or other cause.

(d) The operation of vehicles or combinations of vehicles having dimensions or weights in excess of the maximum limits herein recommended shall be permitted only if authorized by special certificate issued by an appropriate State authority.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for a number of years the States and the Bureau of Public Roads have suggested that greater flexibility will be possible if permission is granted that a limited amount of funds apportioned to the States for use on one segment of the Federal-aid system may be transferred to one of the other segments of the system upon which the needs in that particular State might be more urgent. The 1954 act provides that not to exceed 10 percent of the funds apportioned to either the primary, secondary, or urban systems may be transferred to either of the other. The act contains a provision which further limits the amount transferable, so as to prohibit any transfer which would increase by more than 10 percent the amount originally apportioned to any one of the systems. The committee has been advised that this feature of the 1954 act has worked well, and has facilitated the prosecution in a more orderly manner of the program in a number of States.

Mr. President, any program dealing with the magnificent, broad thoroughfares which are called the interstate highways, and with the urban highways and primary highways, and down to the farm-to-market highways in 48 States and some of the Territories must have flexibility. It must have written into it, inherent in it, the capacity of modification to meet the demands of the respective States and communities. The committee was prepared to provide for that. We were pleased with the reports we had from the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, on the working of this provision. Representatives of the States have suggested that transfer authority up to 25 percent would be desirable. The committee was not prepared to go that far, but does recommend that this authority be increased from 10 percent to 20 percent.

The committee also visualizes that there might be some instances in which it would be desirable to transfer interstate funds to primary, secondary, or urban projects, or vice versa. Accordingly, transfer authority was extended to interstate funds. In view of the difference in matching ratio in interstate funds, however, the bill further provides that the Federal Government's share of the cost of any project financed with transfer funds shall not exceed 50 percent.

If the proposed new interstate system is to attain maximum usefulness by serving the large volume of traffic for which it is designed, it is essential that authority for control of access be provided to the extent required in the area in which the highway is located. The committee does not expect absolute uniformity in this regard, but expects that interstate traffic shall be accorded consideration equal to that accorded intrastate traffic, and vice versa. The committee was impressed with statistics presented, which not only indicated that highways with

controlled access are able to accommodate a larger volume of traffic, but also showed that the incidence of accidents thereon is much lower than on highways without access control. I acknowledge that on this subject my own thinking underwent considerable modification.

Some States, because of a lack of statutory or congressional authority, do not have legal means of acquiring and maintaining a controlled access right-of-way. That problem faced the committee, which decided to deal with it in the manner recommended in the administration bill. Section 4 of the bill provides that in such cases, and upon request of the State, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to acquire within the State a controlled access right-of-way, provided the Secretary determines that the State is unable to secure such right-of-way with reasonable promptness, and provided the State agrees to reimburse the Federal Government its pro rata share of the cost. It is the intent of the bill that in instances in which the provisions of section 4 are used, the Federal Government is, in practical effect, acting as the agent of the State, and can act in that manner only upon the request of the State. Upon acquisition of such rights-of-way at the request of the State, the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey the right-of-way to the State, retaining only the outside 5 feet, so as to permit control of access. Whenever the State is in a position to maintain control of access, the remaining 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

In the same section of the bill, there is language relating to outdoor advertising adjacent to the right-of-way. Some of our States have acted to regulate or control such advertising. The committee feels that the State is the proper agency to regulate such matters. It appeared to the committee that in instances in which the State requests the Secretary of Commerce to acquire a right-of-way, it would be advisable to grant the Secretary permissive authority to purchase the exclusive advertising rights along a strip of land adjacent to the right-of-way. Mr. President, before the committee there was testimony that in the State of New York, where a new highway had been constructed, the advertising rights along or within a strip adjacent to the right-of-way had been acquired for the nominal sum of approximately only \$100 a mile. The bill provides, however, that in the event any such rights are so acquired, they shall be conveyed to the State, without restrictions, at the same time when the right-of-way is conveyed, thus insuring that State jurisdiction over such matters is preserved without question.

In order to expedite initiation of interstate projects, section 5 of the bill grants to the Secretary of Commerce contract authority to the extent of \$100 million, to be used for the acquisition of rights-of-way for the proposed interstate system during the fiscal year 1956. In other words, Mr. President, the committee has included a provision by means of which this program, if enacted, can get under way on July 1, 1955.

Construction funds would not be apportioned until July 1, 1956, for the fiscal

year 1957, but if this program were enacted, the Secretary of Commerce could begin on July 1 a vigorous program of right-of-way acquisition. The funds could be apportioned, surveys could be made, designs prepared, blueprints drawn, and the program vastly accelerated.

This provision does not constitute an additional authorization of funds. Any funds unexpended pursuant to this authorization are to be charged against subsequent apportionments to the States in which expended. The committee believes that this provision will permit actual initiation of construction during the fiscal year 1957, without the necessity of delays occasioned by the acquisition of rights-of-way.

The estimate of \$100 million was supplied to the committee by the Bureau of Public Roads. The committee accepted the recommendation of the Bureau of Public Roads in that respect.

For a number of years, the committee has had under consideration the problems faced by utilities who are forced to relocate their facilities as a result of highway construction or reconstruction. In many instances, the utilities concerned, particularly the small ones, find it almost impossible to finance the capital outlay required for such relocation. Under an accelerated construction program such as is provided for under the bill, the problem will become even more acute. The utilities point out that in most instances they receive no benefit whatsoever from such relocation and they urge that, to the extent they are not benefited, the cost of such relocation should be considered as a normal part of the cost of highway construction, with appropriate reimbursement to the utilities. This has been a troublesome problem to the committee. For one, I have resisted the payment of reimbursement of these costs, but the problem remains without solution. As I have stated, it becomes more pressing particularly as a result of the unprecedented highway construction and improvement program which is proposed.

The seriousness of this problem was recognized last year by the committee. The 1954 act directed the Secretary of Commerce to study the subject and to report to the Congress. This study, filed this year, indicates that the utilities are, in fact, subjected to considerable financial burdens as a result of relocations. Some States have recognized the equity of the relocation problem and already, by law or practice, reimburse utilities for costs properly attributable to relocations necessitated by highway construction. In such cases, the Federal law provides that Federal funds may be used to pay the Federal Government's pro rata share of any such reimbursement with respect to a Federal-aid project. In many of the States, however, the entire cost must be borne by the utilities.

Thus, the Federal Government was in the incongruous position of paying 50 percent, or even up to 60 percent, of the cost of relocation of utilities in some States, and paying no part of the cost in other States. I believe it is fair to say that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was most per-

suasive in this regard, and more effective, perhaps, than any other member of the subcommittee. Perhaps I should not make comparisons, but I believe it is fair to say that no member of the subcommittee was more effective in working out a formula acceptable to the committee, which we hope will provide a solution for this problem. In the end I supported the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The committee believes there is merit in the position taken by the utilities. Section 11 of the bill authorizes the use of Federal funds to pay 50 percent of such relocation costs occasioned by the construction of a Federal-aid project, without regard to whether reimbursement is made by the State. In other words, this provision now places the Federal Government in the position of treating alike all utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, no matter in what State they may be. This provision does not affect or limit the right of the utilities to receive reimbursement in excess of 50 percent from both the Federal Government and the States in those States in which reimbursement is already made.

The bill specifically limits the amount of funds that may be used for this purpose to 2 percent of the State's apportionment. Should relocation costs, otherwise reimbursable, exceed this amount, pro rata distribution will be effected.

Section 11 specifically provides that such reimbursement shall be available to any utility, whether publicly, privately, or cooperatively owned. Care is taken to insure that in arriving at the cost upon which reimbursement is to be based, full consideration is to be given to any betterment accruing to the utility as a result of relocation, and to the salvage value of the old facility.

Existing law authorizes the designation of 40,000 miles of the primary highway system as a national system of interstate highways. Of this total authorization, some 37,600 have been designated. The remaining 2,400 miles have been reserved to permit designation of circumferential routes and connecting links in urban areas. The Bureau of Public Roads indicated to the committee that it has already received requests for such designations in urban areas far in excess of 2,400 miles, and it appears to the committee that this 2,400 miles will be insufficient for the purposes for which they were reserved. In addition, witnesses appeared before the committee to urge designation of additional important routes as a part of the interstate system.

Individual members of the committee suggested other routes, with respect to which meritorious considerations were offered warranting their inclusion in the interstate system. Under these circumstances, the committee considered it advisable to increase the maximum authorization from 40,000 miles to 42,500 miles for the interstate system. That provision will be found in section 12 of the bill. The additional interstate mileage is to be designated in accordance with the same procedures and in accordance with the same criteria applicable to the original 40,000 miles. The committee did not

undertake to designate a particular road as an interstate highway. The committee felt that decision of that question should properly be reserved to the Department of Commerce. As a safeguard the committee went so far as to request the Bureau of Public Roads, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to submit the criteria and indices by which the additional interstate mileage will be designated. With 2,400 miles of the existing 40,000 limitation still remaining undesignated, plus 2,500 included in the bill, there would be available to the Department of Commerce 4,900 miles, approximately, which could be used in designating interstate highways. That is important.

In view of the fact that under this bill the Federal Government will henceforth pay 90 percent of the cost of the interstate highways, and 50 percent of the cost of the other Federal-aid highways, the committee felt that it needed to have in the record the criteria and indices and guideposts the Department would use in making further designations.

The committee considered most carefully the role of toll roads as related to the Federal-aid highway system. A number of toll roads already constructed have been highly successful from a financial standpoint. Evidence presented to the committee, however, indicates that the total prospective mileage of economically feasible toll roads is indeed limited. The committee questioned the advisability of the toll method of financing of segments of the interstate system. Basically, the interstate system is viewed and envisioned as a magnificent system of free interstate highways connecting all principal cities.

Under present law, Federal funds cannot be applied to the cost of constructing a toll road. The committee believes this provision of law is sound and should be retained. There is no question, however, that where economically feasible, toll roads may make important contributions as a supplement to our system of free highways.

The committee believes that the economic feasibility of such toll roads might be strengthened and broadened if they are constructed on an integrated basis through the medium of interstate compacts. Sections 15 and 16 of the bill are designated to encourage the States to explore the possible use of interstate compacts for this purpose.

There was testimony before the committee by competent authorities that a toll road from Boston to Miami would likely be economically feasible if all the States would cooperate and enter into a compact to integrate the system into one economic unit.

Section 17 of the bill extends the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to all construction projects on the national system of interstate highways. As the Members of the Senate know, the provisions of this act apply to construction contracts paid for in full with Federal funds. Action has already been taken by the Congress to extend the provisions of the act to certain construction contracts which are paid for in part by Federal funds made available through

grants-in-aid. For example, the provisions of the act have been made applicable to hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act and to the construction of airport projects involving Federal-aid funds. In view of the fact that the Federal Government is to pay 90 percent of the cost of projects on the Interstate system, the committee recommends that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act should apply to such projects. The committee was of the opinion that it would not be practicable to extend the provisions of the act to projects on the primary and secondary systems, many of which are located in predominately rural and isolated areas and on which the States contribute 50 percent of the cost. Accordingly, the provisions of section 17 of the bill limit application of the Davis-Bacon Act to interstate projects.

Section 13 of the bill contains a declaration of legislative policy and intent. By the terms of this section, it is declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway system should be improved to standards of adequacy to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The committee report refers to the 5-year authorization contained in the bill as the first installment of a vigorous program to meet this objective.

Section 13 declares that one of the most important objectives of this act is the prompt completion of the National System of Interstate Highways. The national interest is paramount in this system of interstate highways. As I understand the provisions and the intent of this bill, its primary purpose is to bring to a condition of adequacy all of our Federal-aid highways, but with particular emphasis upon the objective of building magnificent highways connecting all of our principal cities and State capitals. We envisioned this grand system of national interstate highways as being, for the most part, four-lane highways. In some cases, of course, two lanes will suffice for the time being in sparsely settled areas, but for the most part, it is the intent to build four-lane highways designed to standards to serve the growing national traffic needs. Four-lane highways will not suffice in many other instances. Six and eight-lane highways will be necessary in many instances to accommodate traffic.

Section 13 also states that, insofar as possible, in consonance with this objective of a magnificent national highway system, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible. It also declares it to be the legislative intent of this bill that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate travel and commerce.

Mr. President, I believe I have alluded to the principal features of S. 1048. The program embodied in this bill envisions a magnificent highway system for America, the like of which no other nation has ever dreamed. Your committee believes that such a system of highways is essential for the continued growth and pros-

perity of our national economy and vital to national defense.

The committee recommends passage of the bill; and I personally commend the bill to the Members of the Senate and solicit its careful consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORRON], I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by us jointly, for the bill S. 1048.

I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed. It is my intention to call it up at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORRON in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I feel this is a proper occasion to commend the President of the United States for his outstanding service in centering attention upon the vital need of bringing the highways of the Nation as rapidly as possible up to the standards demanded by present and future traffic requirements.

Through his initiative and the effective measures he has taken, there is virtually unanimous agreement that an accelerated program of highway construction and modernization is of paramount importance to insure a sound and expanding economy, to cut down the tragic toll of death and injury on our congested and inadequate highways, and to serve the national defense.

It may be safely said that every section of our country is highway conscious today. The people of every State look to Congress to provide the means by which we can complete the construction of the largest number of miles of modern highway in the shortest time and at the lowest cost to the taxpayers.

Those objectives are no longer a matter of controversy. It is universally recognized that we are paying a high price in money and lives because we have not kept pace with the vastly increased traffic needs. The Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that 3,500 lives could be saved every year by modernizing the national system of interstate highways. The Automobile Manufacturers Association has estimated that an annual saving of more than \$2 billion could be accomplished by the modernization of that vitally important network of roads. Other authorities have placed the annual cost of our inadequate system of highways as high as \$3 billion a year.

The savings I have mentioned, let me point out, are in addition to the tremendous benefits that would be derived from strengthening the national and civilian defense and the peacetime economy.

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that we are fortunate to have before us today a plan for highway development and expansion based on the most exhaustive and most comprehensive studies ever made of our Nation's needs.

For the first time in our history we have a program that points the way to orderly progress and gives assurance of successful completion. The time has come when it is absolutely essential to have such a program in order to avoid

the haphazard methods by which many of our roads were developed in the past.

For many years roads were built, not where they were needed most, but where the strongest political pressure was exerted. I need not elaborate on the folly of continuing that kind of costly blundering and bungling in road construction.

It is obvious, therefore, that a completely new approach must be found if we are to solve the complex problems involved in this great undertaking; and let me impress upon my colleagues that this is the biggest and most expensive project ever undertaken by the United States outside of war.

The most careful consideration must be given to the method of financing, so that the desired objective can be reached without imposing new and heavier taxes, and without adding more billions to our already staggering burden of national debt.

Under any plan that may be enacted, the American people will be called upon to pay the bill. We must see to it that they get full value for their money.

Every study which has been made points clearly to the conclusion that a project of such magnitude cannot be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis from current revenues. It therefore seems to me that a pay-as-you-use financing plan offers the best and most practical method for the liquidation of the debt that will be incurred. By that method the cost is paid primarily by those who receive the benefits of an improved highway system.

In this connection I call attention to a most significant statement by the Honorable Robert F. Kennon, the distinguished Governor of the State of Louisiana and chairman of the governors' conference.

In a recent discussion of the Nation's highway needs, Governor Kennon said:

If the billions collected in Federal excises on highway users since 1917 had been put on roads instead of general operations it would have meant roads built and in being that you couldn't buy today for \$50 billion.

I submit, Mr. President, that the pay-as-you-use plan, based on Federal gasoline and special fuel tax revenues, offers a sound basis for complete liquidation of the indebtedness, which cannot be avoided if we are to go forward without delay on a highway program that is vital to the welfare of every American.

In concluding these brief remarks, I desire to express my praise and appreciation of the splendid manner in which the hearings on the highway bills were conducted by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Never in my experience has any legislation been examined more thoroughly or with greater care. Every interested group or individual who desired to do so was given full opportunity to present his views or recommendations. The hearings extended over a period of 8 weeks, and at all times there was a good attendance of Senators, not only of the subcommittee but also of the full committee.

I am happy to take this opportunity to thank my good friend, the able Senator from Tennessee, for his patience, his

impartiality, and his generous helpfulness to members of the Public Works Committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I am deeply grateful for the very complimentary and generous remarks of the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I say to him, however, that, try hard as I might, I could not match the fairness, generosity, and ability with which the able Senator presided over the committee during the previous 2 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the very kind remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee are sincerely appreciated.

I observe on the floor now the able chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I have been a member of that committee since coming to the Senate, and I have admired greatly the impartial way in which the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico has presided over the committee's proceedings.

We have prided ourselves, as a committee, on being nonpartisan. We have attempted to report to the Senate bills which would be for the general good of the Nation.

I think at this session a splendid job has been done in having appear before the committee persons from all parts of the country to testify relative to the road situation of the Nation.

Again, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his impartiality and the excellent way in which he conducted the hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his kindness and his complimentary words. I have served on the Committee on Public Works both under the Senator from West Virginia and under the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I can say, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania, that there never has been in that committee any politics. We felt it was a constructive committee, and that the building of adequate roads had nothing to do with politics; that good roads were necessary in Republican Pennsylvania and were equally necessary in Democratic New Mexico. We felt that floods were causing damage in the Republican States of Nebraska and South Dakota just as they were causing damage in Democratic Mississippi. So the bill the Senate is now considering is not partisan. If the bill is examined carefully, it will be found that some of the provisions suggested by the administration are contained in the bill, or, anyway, that was the intention of the majority which reported the bill.

It will be found that while at times we did have differences of opinion in the committee as to how certain objectives should be attained, there was never any politics involved.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have a few very brief remarks to make about the bill today, but shall have more to say about it next week. Before I com-

ment on the pending bill, and the ultimate plan which we discussed so long in the committee, I wish to associate myself again with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and also the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. MARTIN], who has just complimented the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] very highly for the way the business of the committee has been conducted.

I feel that the Senator from Tennessee, who conducted the long hearings of the subcommittee, did a very remarkable job, and expedited the business of the committee substantially. It was very difficult to do that, because there was so much to be said, but he performed the task skillfully and fairly. He won the admiration of the entire committee for the way he presided over its deliberations. I am delighted to compliment him, and also the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, for the manner in which he conducted the proceedings when the bill came before the full committee. Nobody can say that everyone did not have a fair chance to press his views and influence the thinking of the committee, to the extent of his ability. So I am delighted to make those acknowledgments.

Mr. President, one of the principal issues regarding the bill is the question of financing this great, expanded road program. I think everyone agrees that an interstate system is needed, and it should be completed as soon as possible. The question is, How are we to get it and how are we to pay for it?

I will admit that last December, when I first read the comments of the Clay Committee, I had some doubts as to the financing scheme which was proposed; but I have spent a great deal of time in the last 6 months thinking about and studying that plan, and also studying the testimony concerning it, which has been given by distinguished members of the administration, as well as by Senators who are both for and against this type of financing plan. I am now satisfied completely that the plan is sound. It is legally, practically, and morally sound.

There is nothing new about the plan in principle. It is a plan which has been heretofore used very effectively by States and by creatures of the States, greatly to the benefit of the people, and particularly the motoring public.

I have come to the conclusion that, far from being a dangerous or an undesirable plan, it is really the only desirable plan which has been proposed, and provides the only satisfactory way by which we can finance such a gigantic proposition as the proposed interstate highway system.

The importance of the interstate highway system is so great that it has to be provided for now; it must be completed within 10 years, and must be put in effect as a whole, and not piecemeal.

One of the chief arguments against the Gore bill is that it does not insure continuity in the progress of the work. If there ever was a time when long-range planning was essential in connection

with a road program, this is most assuredly the time.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] said, the plan contained in S. 1160, the Clay bill, or the Martin bill, or whatever one may choose to call it, is a pay-as-you-use plan. Nobody who has been in business would say that it is not good business to borrow money to build productive assets. That is the only purpose of borrowing money in the field of commerce and industry. It should be likewise in government.

Where we have had toll roads, which, in effect, have been pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-use assets, they have paid very well, indeed far better than it was estimated they would pay. Nobody has ever said they were not sound.

What is sounder than to take the additional taxes which will come from additional assets and using such taxes to discharge liabilities which have been created in order to develop those assets, especially when at this time, as never before, the assets are absolutely necessary to the national defense, to interstate commerce, and to safe travel for the citizens of our country?

Mr. President, I think the debate on this issue is apt to center around the points which we have set forth at the beginning of the minority views which Senators have on their desks. I venture the hope that over the weekend Senators will give both the majority report and the minority views their close attention, so that next week we can save as much time as possible in the course of this debate. I should like to outline our views as to why we oppose S. 1048 and why we favor S. 1160. I read the following from the minority views:

We oppose S. 1048 because:

1. It will not build within 10 years, or any other given period, the National System of Interstate Highways, essential in peacetime to the growth of our prosperity, and in time of war vital to survival.

2. It offers no plan to finance construction of the interstate system, except through higher taxes and increased general debt.

3. It creates an illusion of roads which will not be there.

4. It places burdensome and expensive Federal controls over highway construction and operation which heretofore have been left exclusively to the States.

5. It discriminates against States which have had the initiative to go forward with highways, both free and toll, serving the interstate system.

We favor S. 1160 because:

1. It builds the interstate system within a period of 10 years, thus (a) reducing the terrible toll in automobile deaths and injuries, (b) promoting commerce between the States, the lifeblood of our economy, and (c) strengthening our military and civilian defense.

2. It guides Federal dollars so that they follow and serve Federal responsibilities and greatest Federal needs.

3. It permits the orderly development of other highway systems—primary, secondary, and urban—while making certain that the most important from the national standpoint—the Interstate System of Defense Highways—is built for use now, instead of 20 or 30 years from now, or perhaps never.

4. It does not impair States' rights.

5. It offers a sound pay-as-you-use financing plan which does not require increased taxes, but which does provide for liquidation of the debt to be incurred and for its

payment primarily by those who most benefit.

6. It deals fairly with those States which have progressed with modern free and toll highways serving the interstate system.

Mr. President, in the interests of saving the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the minority views, beginning with the last two paragraphs on page 33, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remainder of the minority views of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON on S. 1048 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY

S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss. These widely scattered dollars will not build those roads having the greatest national interest. They will not bring about the completion of the National System of Interstate Highways so vitally needed for the safety of our citizens, our national and civil defense, and our economy. They may affect votes, but they do not solve this country's road problem.

In contrast to S. 1048, the so-called Clay or administration bill, S. 1160, accomplishes the clear-cut objective of building the interstate system within a 10-year period and financing it on a debt-liquidating basis without raising taxes. It faces the vexing problems involved and solves them. It blazes a new trail in Federal road legislation demanded by present-day conditions.

This country needs adequate highways now, not 20 years from now. Everyone admits, and the hearings prove, that our present highways are entirely inadequate. The backbone of our highways is the 40,000 miles of the interstate system. This system is relatively the most inadequate. This system involves the greatest national interest and responsibility, and should receive top priority. Its completion is a military and economic necessity.

The majority are going on the theory that dollars alone will solve all problems. They fail to follow the advice of most of our experts, and so fail to guide the use of those dollars to a definite objective. They fail to take into account the fact that a number of States will be unable to match the Federal dollars authorized. They fail to provide any definite plan for the completion of the interstate system, and thereby utterly disregard the national- and civil-defense needs of this country during this most critical period of its history. They leave this system unfinished even though the Federal participation is 90 percent of the cost.

Not only do the majority fail to directly tackle our greatest needs, but they blindly refuse to be concerned with the fact that the people of this country have been taxed, and taxed, and taxed, and that the public debt has mounted to staggering proportions. They ignore the administration's solution of building the interstate system without any increase in taxes and on a sound debt-liquidating basis (pay-as-you-use). They refuse to take into account the fact that roads are a capital asset which generate their own revenues.

In reporting out S. 1048 the majority are not merely guilty of legerdemain. S. 1048 exemplifies legislative deception run wild. S. 1048 will pull no roads out of a hat on a pay-as-you-use basis. It will keep many roads so well under the hat that they will never be constructed, but the general debt will rise and the taxpayers will be burdened with interest charges indefinitely.

We are not alone in our opposition to S. 1048, or in our wholehearted approval of S. 1160. In addition to the Clay Committee and the national governor's conference, the American Municipal Association, consisting of upward of 12,000 municipalities in 44 States, the American trucking associations, and others vitally concerned with highway transportation, have indicated their approval of S. 1160. The American Association of State Highway Officials has gone on record that it is in accord with the provisions of S. 1160, which require the completion of the interstate system within 10 years. Thus many of the persons and organizations most interested, or expert, in road problems endorse S. 1160, and therefore must either actually oppose S. 1048, or at least have a substantial preference for S. 1160.

The contrast between the well-planned and carefully considered S. 1160 and S. 1048 is striking. The following points need serious consideration:

S. 1048 WILL NOT BUILD THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM WITHIN 10 YEARS, OR ANY OTHER GIVEN PERIOD

S. 1048 lacks a realistic approach to the objective of prompt completion of the interstate system, and under it, in our opinion, the system will not be completed. The majority emphasize the importance of the interstate system in their large authorizations for it relative to the other systems, but they have in fact authorized only 30 percent of the funds necessary to complete it.

(a) *The apportionment of the interstate funds under S. 1048 is not based on actual needs*

Section 2 (a) of S. 1048 provides for the apportionment of the interstate-system funds in the same manner as the 1954 act; namely, one-half in the manner now provided for funds on the primary system, and one-half in the ratio which the population of a particular State bears to the total population of all States. Calculations made on this basis of apportionment indicate clearly that some States will not receive sufficient funds to construct the portion of the interstate system lying within their boundaries, while other States will receive more funds than they can use on the interstate system.

It is obvious that this situation is bound to exist when the facts are taken into account. Primary system funds are apportioned on the basis of a State's area, population, and mileage of rural-delivery routes and star routes. Accordingly, one-half of the interstate funds are being apportioned under an old formula developed for an entirely different purpose. The apportionment of the other one-half is based on population. The interstate system was designated so as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers to serve the national defense. Any similarity to the amount of the actual cost of construction of the interstate system in a particular State and the funds apportioned to that State under S. 1048 must necessarily be purely coincidental.

The result of this lack of legislative realism will be that the interstate system will not be constructed, for it is entirely unlikely that those States which do not receive sufficient funds will complete their portions of the system. On the other hand, those States which receive more than they need will, undoubtedly, take advantage of the provision of S. 1048 which permits the transfer of 20 percent of their interstate funds to other systems, and so they would receive an inequitable windfall.

This is one of a number of instances which evidence the failure of the majority to grasp the fundamental concept of the Clay report and S. 1160. This concept involves a complete departure from the 1921 pattern of road legislation in that it has for its purpose the completion of a particular system of roads within a given period. This

purpose cannot be accomplished without paying for the construction of such a system on the basis of its cost. This concept is the only one which will build the system.

(b) *Insufficient funds authorized*

S. 1048 authorizes the appropriation of Federal funds for the interstate system for the next 5 years in the total amount of \$7,750 million. Estimates indicate that the total cost of the interstate system will approximate \$27 billion. The authorization of less than 30 percent of the entire cost obviously will not build the system.

S. 1160 WILL BUILD THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM WITHIN A PERIOD OF 10 YEARS AND WILL PROVIDE ADEQUATE STANDARDS AND PERMIT LONG-RANGE PLANNING

The objective of S. 1160 is the completion of the construction of the interstate system within the next 10 years. This system undoubtedly is the country's most important system, both from an economic and also a national- and civil-defense viewpoint. The Department of Defense strongly endorsed S. 1160. This system is the backbone of our entire highway system. The other systems are complementary to this system and more readily lend themselves to gradual improvement. The interstate system, though it embraces only 1.2 percent of total road mileage, joins 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. It carries more than a seventh of all traffic. The completion of this system with control of access will provide the means for movement of military men and material in time of war and will substantially promote interstate commerce in time of peace. The completion of this system is a Federal responsibility.

In considering the importance of this system should war be thrust upon us, the need for evacuating target areas must never be forgotten. As the President of the United States said in his message on the highway program:

"In case of an atomic attack on our key cities, the road net must permit quick evacuation of target areas, mobilization of defense forces, and maintenance of every essential economic function. But the present system in critical areas would be the breeder of a deadly congestion within hours of an attack."

S. 1160 recognizes this problem. An element of its plan is the provision for urban connections to the interstate system which are so urgently needed.

(a) *The allocation of Federal funds is based on actual needs*

S. 1160 recognizes the indisputable fact that the way to get the interstate system is to pay for it. Therefore, it permits the allocation of funds to the various States on the basis of their actual needs. It recognizes that the cost of construction substantially varies from State to State because of the differences in mileage, terrain, traffic, and various other factors.

In the past, formulas were developed seeking to permit an equitable distribution of Federal dollars to the States. The objective of S. 1160 is not the apportionment of Federal dollars, but rather the construction of a nationally important system of highways. Accordingly, a formula merely distributing dollars is neither warranted nor workable. The absence of such a formula affords no basis for a charge of favoritism of one State over another, since the 37,600 miles of the system were designated many years ago pursuant to legislative mandate, and long before there was any thought of a plan such as the present one. The system is laid out from a national viewpoint and on a basis of the economic and defense needs of the entire country.

(b) *Sufficient funds authorized for completion of interstate system*

The Bureau of Public Roads received estimates from all of the States as to the cost

of construction of the interstate system. These estimates formed the basis for the estimate by the Clay Committee that the cost of the whole interstate system would approximate \$27 billion. S. 1160 provides for Federal participation to the extent of \$25 billion. It requires dollar payments by the States equaling those to be made by them for the interstate system under the 1954 act. Thus, S. 1160 authorizes all of the funds estimated to be needed for the completion of the whole interstate system.

(c) *Long-range planning*

In providing for the entire cost, S. 1160 makes possible a continuing program over a 10-year period. This permits long-range planning. In any major construction project, long-range planning is essential. The Panama Canal and the St. Lawrence Seaway are examples of projects authorized by Congress where long-range planning was provided. If we are to have an interstate system constructed within 10 years, the same type of approach is necessary. Advance planning is particularly important today to make possible prompt acquisition of rights-of-way. It is also important in that it permits the acquisition and use of machinery and materials on a more economical basis. S. 1048 does not permit advance planning because it provides only 30 percent of the necessary funds.

(d) *Standards required*

It is further the objective of S. 1160 to build the interstate system up to such standards as will produce safe highways adequate to handle traffic needs for at least the next 20 years. There is no question but that the interstate system must be built to the highest standards. The standards set out in S. 1160 have been carefully considered and are generally acceptable to the American Association of State Highway Officials and others who have a primary interest in roads. If we are to have a safe and efficient interstate system of highways, it is essential that they be built to adequate standards. This not only makes the highways safer but also tends to make them permanent and so protects the Nation's capital investment.

S. 1048 AUTHORIZES FEDERAL DOLLARS A NUMBER OF THE STATES CANNOT MATCH

During the past 30 years it has been customary for Congress to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds for roads on a biennial basis. In 1954 this Congress passed the largest road act from the point of view of Federal dollars in the history of the country. The authorizations almost doubled the authorizations contained in the 1948 act. The authorizations contained in S. 1048 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, more than double the authorizations contained in the 1954 act. Even with this tremendous increase in authorizations, the emphasis in S. 1048 is upon distributing dollars, instead of building roads where they are most urgently needed. S. 1048 gives the States more and more Federal dollars without a target for the expenditure of such dollars. It also authorizes Federal dollars that a number of the States cannot match.

In contrast, S. 1160 plans the construction of the interstate system within a 10-year period. It aims at this single objective, and no other. Today's demands on the Federal Treasury are enormous. The Federal Government cannot fully meet every such de-

mand. Congress must decide which are the most urgent demands. Most of the road experts agree that the interstate system is the most important and should be given top priority. S. 1160 follows this expert opinion and aims the available Federal dollars where they will be most productive. S. 1048 scatters them so that they will not only be less productive, but some of them will not produce at all.

Ever since 1916, when the first modern-road legislation was enacted, the States have matched their Federal-aid apportionments with but two minor exceptions. Despite this precedent, the present record contains a survey made by the American Association of State Highway Officials indicating that 26 of the 48 States would have been unable to match their Federal-aid apportionments under S. 1048 as originally introduced. While the amendments to S. 1048 would probably reduce this number, unquestionably there will still be a number of States that cannot match. In addition, some of the States, in order to meet matching requirements, will have to divert funds that they would ordinarily spend entirely on their own local needs and not on Federal-aid highways. The authorizations to States which cannot match are illusory and tend to prevent larger authorizations for the more important interstate system.

PROVISIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM PERMIT ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT OF OTHER SYSTEMS

The charge has been made that S. 1160 would hamper development of the other Federal-aid systems, primary, urban, and secondary. This is based upon a misconception and is totally erroneous. On the contrary, S. 1160 would encourage the orderly development of these systems by (a) releasing to the States huge sums which they have heretofore had to use as matching funds for the Interstate System, and (b) permitting periodic review by the Congress of highway needs. Traditionally, the Congress has considered highway legislation in the even-numbered years. If this practice is continued, as would be the case if S. 1160 were adopted, the needs for the other systems could be carefully considered on a current basis and with full recognition of the ability of the States to raise the required matching funds.

The authorizations in the 1954 act are the largest in history for all of the systems. This act authorized \$175 million for the Interstate System for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957. The 1952 act authorized \$25 million for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955. Prior to the 1952 act there were no authorizations for the Interstate System as such. Routes of the 40,000-mile Interstate System coincide to a great extent with those on the 235,000-mile primary system. As a result, the States up to the present time have been expending substantial portions of their primary and urban funds on routes of the Interstate System.

The following table graphically illustrates the substantial amounts of primary and urban funds allotted to Interstate System projects in the past 2 calendar years. These averaged about \$140 million in each of these years. This sum constituted about one-third of the total Federal primary and urban funds allotted for these years.

Primary and urban funds used on interstate projects

	Primary		Urban		Total	
	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Federal funds allotted to Interstate System projects.....	\$70,719,411	\$69,516,787	\$64,506,792	\$76,769,222	\$135,226,203	\$146,286,009
Federal funds allotted to all projects....	\$224,113,039	\$300,129,879	\$154,983,174	\$178,132,203	\$379,096,213	\$478,262,082
Percent allotted to interstate projects..	31.6	23.2	41.6	43.1	35.7	30.6

The tremendously increased allocations for the interstate system, together with the much more favorable matching ratio, will undoubtedly relieve the States of their obligations in connection with the Interstate System which they have heretofore fulfilled out of primary and urban funds. From now on the States will be relieved of spending primary money on the more costly portions of the primary system that coincide with the Interstate System. If this had been true in 1953 and 1954, the States would have had about \$140 million more Federal funds in each of those years to spend on those portions of the primary system which do not coincide with the interstate system. This will produce roads equivalent to an additional authorization of this sum. When this fact is taken into account it becomes clear how unnecessary additional primary and urban authorizations are at this time.

S. 1160 DOES NOT FREEZE OTHER SYSTEM AUTHORIZATIONS

Criticism has been leveled at S. 1160 on the erroneous ground that authorizations for the other systems are frozen at their present level. We wish to make it clear that S. 1160 does not purport to, nor does it in fact, make provision for other systems. S. 1160 is a bill relating solely to the Interstate System. There is nothing in S. 1160 that would prevent Congress from increasing the present authorizations for other systems at such times as the need arises and the States are able to match the authorizations.

This confusion may have arisen from the fact that the Clay Committee recommends Federal authorizations for other systems totaling \$622,500,000, and that section 105 (b) of S. 1160 uses this figure as a measure in connection with the taxes to be available for financing the interstate system. This is not legislation specifically authorizing these amounts for the other systems. Absolutely no provision is contained in S. 1160 which authorizes or freezes amounts for the other systems. Under the 1954 act, these authorizations have been made through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. S. 1160 is properly limited solely to the Interstate System.

S. 1048 IN CONTRAST TO S. 1160 PLACES SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION, WHICH UP TO NOW HAVE BEEN LEFT EXCLUSIVELY TO THE STATES

Section 17 of S. 1048 provides that any State desiring to accept the benefits of the interstate highway apportionments must come within the Davis-Bacon Act. Section 2 (d) in effect freezes the minimum State requirements for weight and size standards for trucks. These two provisions override a long-established precedent that highway construction shall be carried out under State law, and that States shall have the sole responsibility for the operation and maintenance of highways.

When these provisions are compared with the provisions of S. 1160, the charges that S. 1160 will bring about increases in Federal controls are rendered almost ludicrous. The tremendous increase in Federal control that the above two measures would give are not comparable with the simple provision of S. 1160 which permits the corporation to settle disputes between the Secretary of Commerce and the States if such disputes shall arise. How any proponent of S. 1048 in the light of its very real controls can seriously criticize S. 1160 on the ground that it adds to Federal controls is difficult to understand.

The undersigned firmly endorse the principle of fair labor standards legislation, and believe that its application in some fields by the Federal Government is proper and desirable. However, its proposed application to Federal-aid highways raises many problems which require the most thoughtful study.

We believe this matter should be fully and carefully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, since serious questions concerning labor relations are involved. However, since it was before this committee, we feel that we must point out some of the considerations which lead us to suggest a cautious approach.

The Davis-Bacon Act was enacted by Congress during the early stages of the depression of the 1930's. At that time very few, if any, of the States had minimum-wage laws on their statute books, nor had the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act been passed. Today, two-thirds of the States have minimum-wage laws or are operating under general labor-management areawide wage rate agreements covering highway construction. Indications are that about one-half of the States have minimum-wage laws based on prevailing rates being paid in the locality of the work. Labor classifications in those States follow in most cases the general pattern set in union-employer agreements, and in some areas are parallel to those used in the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act is now applicable to highway work performed under direct Federal contract. It requires, prior to the advertising for bids, that minimum-wage rates be determined for all laborers and mechanics employed on the project. These minimum rates are based on prevailing rates in the area. The boundaries of the area and the methods for determining prevailing rates are determined by the Secretary of Labor. There is no appeal from his decision.

The regulations further require that copies of all payrolls be received and checked by the Bureau of Public Roads for compliance with labor standards, including rates of wages paid, overtime, and classification or reclassification of employees of the contractor or subcontractor, conformable to the labor classes set forth in the Labor Secretary's decision of minimum wage rates to be paid on the project. It has been estimated that some 4,000 contracts would be involved annually under section 17. This would require the checking of upwards of 10 million payroll items for compliance with labor standards provisions. In addition, there would be involved investigations and hearings on wages or other labor disputes growing out of the performance of the contract, and surveys of wage levels.

One only has to glance at the above procedures and figures to understand the vastly increased burden of Federal administrative work involved. Whenever this amount of paperwork becomes involved, delays are bound to occur. Accordingly, the enactment of this section would result in serious delays to the completion of the Interstate System. The procedure indicates the centralized control and vast power which this section would place in the Secretary of Labor.

Those who use the analogy of other Federal legislation, such as the building of a housing project, or an airport, or a hospital, do not take into account the magnitude of the construction work contemplated. Nor do they take into account the fact that roads stretch throughout all parts of the land and affect all communities small and large. It is so vast that other precedents are not appropriate.

The employment of labor is generally recognized as a local matter, affected many times by conditions that do not apply universally. Rates in rural areas frequently are less than those in cities because of living costs and reduced hazards involved in the performance of the work. For example, a laborer on a rural project would be subject to less hazard than one in a downtown locality. A contractor having a large building or housing contract would pay his laborers the same rates whether working on the building itself or on a street or alley to serve a new development. When such a rate is extended to all highway work in the area, both rural

and urban, then the highway rate would be entirely unrealistic and the fixing of such an arbitrary level might have a serious disruptive effect on highway construction.

Such conditions are intensified where it becomes necessary to fix prevailing levels of wage rates based on scattered information received in Washington, often thousands of miles away from the area in question. Such information may not only represent the highest rates in the area but may actually be paid under competitive economic or other conditions of special application only.

It should be noted, finally, that the fact that S. 1048 purports to limit this Federal control to the interstate system is illusory. It will gradually spread vast Federal controls to all Federal-aid highways, including farm-to-market roads. Its effect will also spread to purely local road construction and maintenance in every city, town, village, and hamlet throughout the Nation.

Since these highways will be designed and contracted for by the States, will be built by the States, will belong to the States, and will be maintained and policed by the States, we believe that very careful thought should be given before the Federal Government takes on the heavy burdens of expense involved in checking millions of payroll items for compliance, holding hearings, making investigations, and otherwise extending its activity into areas heretofore universally recognized as responsibilities of the States.

S. 1048 IN CONTRAST TO S. 1160 OFFERS NO PLAN TO FINANCE CONSTRUCTION OF THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

For many years the taxpayers of this country have been subjected to a large number of taxes which have taken a very substantial slice out of their annual wages or income. In spite of this very severe taxation our national debt has mounted to the staggering sum of approximately \$275 billion, and our total incurred indebtedness is perhaps \$95 billion above this figure. We are now paying interest on our debt at the rate of approximately \$7 billion a year. If this interest continued for 30 years, the total interest charges during this period would amount to \$210 billion or 75 percent of the present national debt.

Under these conditions no one desires to increase taxes nor to increase the country's national debt if such increases can be avoided. However, we are faced today with an urgent need from every angle for a greatly accelerated highway-construction program. The question presented is whether or not there is some way to meet this urgent need without raising taxes and without increasing the national debt.

S. 1048 makes no attempt whatsoever to solve this problem. Under S. 1048 there would be a substantial increase in our national debt. We understand that the majority have recommended that taxes should be increased to cover a portion—but only a portion—of the estimated cost. If the House should follow this recommendation we would have both increased taxes and an increase in the national debt.

S. 1160 attempts to solve this problem. It neither increases nor recommends the increase of taxes. It provides that the Corporation may borrow maximum amounts estimated to be sufficient to construct the interstate system. The principal and interest on these borrowings is to be repaid out of amounts equivalent to annual gasoline and special fuel tax revenues in excess of \$622,500,000. It has been estimated that these amounts will be sufficient over a 30-year period to pay for the interstate system. In addition these tax revenues will provide \$622,500,000 annually for other systems.

S. 1160 does not increase the national debt through Treasury borrowings in the conventional manner. Such national debt is a general debt payable out of general revenues. S. 1160 provides a plan for the liquidation,

from gasoline and special fuel tax revenues, of the indebtedness to be incurred by reason of the construction of the Interstate System. Our national debt has mounted alarmingly without any program for its liquidation. While this cannot always be avoided, we do feel where a liquidating program is possible as provided by S. 1160, it should be followed rather than criticized because it is unconventional.

No harmful precedent is established by S. 1160. Government expenditures for highways can be distinguished from nearly all other Government expenditures. A road is a productive asset generating revenues; a bomber or tank is not, nor is a school or a hospital. There can be no question but that a portion of the funds put into the construction of highways represents a capital investment, particularly in the case of the interstate system which will be built to the highest standards. Furthermore, there is no question but that the capital invested in these roads will develop and produce additional income in the form of increased gasoline and other road-user revenues. Intangible revenues are produced in the contribution made to our general economic development. The financing plan proposed by S. 1160 is sound when applied to a capital investment which will produce its own revenues.

Some of the criticisms of the financing plan of S. 1160 are discussed below.

(a) "Pay-as-you-go"

In view of the fact that S. 1048 would require substantial borrowing by the United States Government, the majority no longer can contend that a pay-as-you-go basis for road construction is necessary. However, we do wish to point out that it is a common practice in many of the States to issue bonds for highway construction. The Federal Government has recognized this practice by permitting within certain limitations the use of Federal funds to reimburse the States, which pay off highway bonds. The criticism against borrowing is unwarranted, and in any event the majority also contemplate borrowing.

(b) Interest payments

There is little substance, when carefully analyzed, in the criticism leveled at the payment of interest under S. 1160. This interest has been estimated to average \$360 million per year, or a total of \$11 billion over a 30-year period. It is impossible to calculate the interest charges under S. 1048. Obviously, under S. 1048 interest will be paid for many years into the future, and will eventually amount to a far higher figure than the interest payments called for under S. 1160. We wish to emphasize again that S. 1160 provides for a complete liquidation of the indebtedness, and so the total amount of the required interest payments can be determined. When the portion of our national debt, that would be created by S. 1048, would be liquidated is not subject to a clear-cut determination and so is necessarily a guess. However, if the past two decades are used as precedents, interest payments under S. 1048 will far exceed those under S. 1160.

(c) Gasoline and special fuel taxes as a measure

S. 1160 has also been criticized because it uses the entire Federal gasoline and special fuel-tax revenues for highway purposes. In 1934 Congress wrote into section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act the following: "Since it is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways, after June 20, 1935, Federal aid for highway construction shall be extended only to those States that use at least the amounts now provided by law for such purposes."

Under this act, Congress penalized those States which did not employ their highway user revenues to highway purposes. This law has been on the books for over 20 years, and it would seem inappropriate at this time to criticize the Federal Government for the expenditure of its entire highway revenues for highway purposes. Twenty-five States have constitutional provisions dedicating highway user taxes to highway purposes.

It is a common practice in the States to pledge highway revenues for the payment of indebtedness instead of using them directly on a pay-as-you-go basis. If they are to be used, it does not seem material whether they are used for direct payments, or whether they are used as a pledge to secure the payment of bonds. While S. 1160 does not in fact pledge these revenues directly for the payment of the proposed highway bonds, it is used as a measure of payment to the corporation which issued the bonds, and so to some extent is analogous to a pledge. We fail to see any objection whatsoever to this procedure.

(d) S. 1160 does not come within section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act—the debt limitations statute

We do not agree for one moment with the final criticism of the financing plan of S. 1160 which seems to be that the creation of a corporation and the issuance of bonds by it is a device which is not only bad policy, but which in effect is deceptive. There are a substantial number of agencies and corporations of one sort or another which are authorized to borrow money for their corporate purposes either directly or through the Treasury. (See appendix C.) We are not aware that deception was charged on the formation of these corporations, and see no reason why it should be in connection with the proposed Federal Highway Corporation.

Possibly the reason for the charge is that it contemplates borrowing the money without coming within the terms of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. The Attorney General has testified before this committee with respect to the legality of the Federal Highway Corporation and has completely refuted statements as to the illegality or deception in this financing plan. Section 21 contains provisions covering Treasury borrowing, and borrowing where the principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States. If these bonds are salable without a Government guaranty, and in fact do not legally come within the terms of the statute—and the Attorney General said that they do not—there is no basis whatsoever for the criticism.

We might add that the United States owes large sums that are not within section 21. Some of these are bonds which were issued before section 21 was enacted. Others are monetary obligations; others are contingent obligations; others are unpaid bills; and others are unobligated authorizations. All in all, the United States is liable for obligations in the above categories, actually incurred or authorized, in an amount approximating \$150 billion. S. 1160 clearly limits the Corporation's public borrowing authority to \$21 billion. In the opinion of the Attorney General, this borrowing is not within the debt limit statute. It is specifically provided in S. 1160 that this borrowing is not to be a guaranteed debt, nor an obligation to which the full faith and credit of the United States is pledged. The entire financing plan is clearly set out, and there is no basis whatsoever for the charge of deception or legerdemain.

S. 1048 IN CONTRAST TO S. 1160 DOES NOT DEAL EQUITABLY WITH STATES WHICH HAVE GONE FORWARD WITH FREE OR TOLL HIGHWAYS SERVING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

S. 1048 discriminates against those States which have made progress with highways, free or toll, serving the interstate system. In

contrast, S. 1160 attempts to make an equitable disposition of funds to those States which have already constructed free or toll roads adequate to be included in this vital system which serves the Nation. S. 1160 also permits the reimbursement to States for toll roads to be constructed in the future.

The problem created by the development of toll roads is one which demands solution. S. 1048 dodges this problem; S. 1160 would solve it.

The Congress must face the facts and realities squarely. The original Federal highway legislation of 1916 contained a provision that all roads constructed under the provisions of that act should be free from tolls of all kinds. This provision has continued unchanged since 1916 and has been deemed by many to be a definite policy statement on the part of Congress that we should have free systems of roads.

Since World War II the demand for roads has increased so rapidly that the State and Federal Governments have not furnished sufficient funds to keep construction in pace with demand. The American public has generally succeeded in getting what it wants. Since the governments have not furnished the funds, the public has partially satisfied its demand for better roads by supporting the construction of toll roads. In the past few years, these roads have been constructed at an increasing rate.

Accordingly, we are today dealing with facts and realities, not theories. Some 2,000 miles of toll roads are actually constructed, and several more thousand are in the process of construction. It is our opinion that Congress should face the problems posed by toll roads and not leave the matter to administrative discretion.

S. 1048 is silent on the question as to whether or not toll roads may be included in the interstate system. S. 1160 in section 202 expressly permits the inclusion of toll roads which meet the standards of the interstate system. Without such permission the interstate system will either be a system that is not connected, and so not a system, or there will be economic waste by reason of the necessity of constructing competing parallel roads in order to have a connected system. If a State desires toll roads and has the population that will support a toll road, equities do exist for permitting a State to receive a credit when that toll road contributes to, and becomes a part of, the interstate system.

The provisions relating to credits contained in section 207 of S. 1160 are premised on the concept that the Federal Government is primarily responsible for the building of the interstate system. Both bills recognize this concept. It is a new concept. If the Federal Government has this responsibility, how can it equitably permit one State to contribute portions of the interstate system with the total cost being borne by that State, while another State receives its portion of the interstate system for 5 percent of the total cost? Suppose one State has already constructed its entire system. Should the Federal Government get the benefit without any cost to it, while it pays another State 95 percent of the cost? We subscribe to the premise that the construction of the interstate system is primarily the Federal Government's responsibility. Once this premise is accepted, equity requires the inclusion of section 207 in S. 1160.

CONCLUSION

We want the interstate system to be built. We need it for our citizens' safety, for our economy, and for our national and civil defense needs. We want to start building it now, and to complete it within a period of 10 years. S. 1160 assures, as well as any legislation can assure anything, that the interstate system will be started now and completed within a period of 10 years. It is based on a realistic appraisal of the States'

needs and ability to pay. S. 1048 assures nothing and does not guide the Federal dollars to their most effective use. Therefore, we strongly oppose S. 1048, and heartily recommend and endorse S. 1160.

EDWARD MARTIN.
PRESCOTT BUSH.
NORRIS COTTON.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall comment briefly on one point which came up this afternoon, although I had not previously intended to do so. I refer to the suggestion that confidence is needed. When it is proposed to undertake a project of such tremendous size, certainly it is necessary to establish confidence. We are dependent upon the contractors who will build the roads, and to some extent we are dependent upon the manufacturers of the machinery which will be used in building the roads. If we establish the program on a long-range, planning basis, and if it is generally known that the program is to be conducted on a 10-year basis, rather than a 5-year basis, and there is certainty that the program will be continued for the 10 years, we shall establish some confidence in the trade or the industry upon which we are dependent for the construction and completion of the roads. The establishment of such confidence will enable the contractors to purchase modern machinery, and will enable the manufacturers to develop more modern machinery and to spend more money on research and the development of improved equipment and generally to conduct themselves in a manner which will be conducive to the reduction of costs for both the State governments and the Federal Government in connection with this gigantic program.

So far as the State of Connecticut is concerned, I may say we have a completely nonpartisan approach to this issue. The able Governor of our State, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, of the Democratic Party, testified before the House committee on Senate bill 1160. He testified in favor of the President's plan and the Clay plan; and he testified on behalf of all the New England governors, 3 of whom are Republicans; and 3 of whom are Democrats. So I think it is clear that in New England, and particularly in the State of Connecticut, the views of the people are not influenced in any manner whatsoever by partisan considerations. On the contrary, their views are influenced by what seems to be in the interest of the entire area and the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram signed by Newman Argraves, State highway commissioner, and Warren Craemer, chief engineer, of the State of Connecticut. I shall read the telegram into the RECORD at this point, as follows:

HARTFORD, CONN., May 19, 1955.
Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

A review has been made by this department of the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1955 (S. 1048, amended; Rept. No. 350).

This bill is more favorable to Connecticut than the original S. 1048. Connecticut will probably be able to match the apportionments indicated by the revised bill. This department has previously, and does now,

favor the passage of the administration bill as opposed to the bill presented by Senator GORE.

Section 13B of this proposed bill declares that one of the most important objectives of the act is the prompt completion of the national system of the interstate highways. Connecticut, for many years, has recognized the desirability of improving this system of highways and has since its designation expended on the interstate system over \$15 million of the \$26 million of Federal-aid funds programed for primary and urban highways.

The passage of Federal-aid highway legislation which provides for greater Federal participation in the construction of the interstate system is highly desirable. It is noted that no clause is included in S. 1048 permitting reimbursement of prior expenditures on the interstate system. A program of increased Federal participation in the cost of improving the interstate system which does not provide for reimbursement of prior State expenditures on this system would be equivalent to imposing a penalty on those States which have recognized the need and have had the initiative to proceed with the improvement of the system.

Section 13D requires transcription of public hearings on projects involving a bypass of any community. It has not been the policy of the Connecticut Highway Department to hold formal hearings or keep transcripts of such hearings, if held. The department does not construct bypasses to any great extent. However, the question might readily be raised as to what constitutes a bypass of any community.

The department also objects to section 17 of the proposed bill as it appears to constitute an invasion of State rights in this field. This department's contracts require the payment of at least the minimum labor rates as established by the State labor department and it appears that there is no reason for the Federal Government entering into the determination of wage scales on highway projects.

Similar telegram has been sent to Senator PURTELL.

NEWMAN E. ARGRAVES,
State Highway Commissioner.
By WARREN M. CREAMER,
Chief Engineer.

Mr. President, this concludes my remarks for today on the bill. The process incident to considering and reporting the bill has been a long and arduous one, as the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who now is the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and who is a member of the committee, knows very well. We are very glad that the bill is now before the Senate.

I consider this issue to be one of the most important which will be before the Congress at this session. I hope all Senators who may not have had a chance thus far to study it will do so within the next few days, for I am satisfied that a program involving from \$21 billion to \$25 billion of the funds of the United States Government deserves the closest possible attention and scrutiny by all Members of the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it a fact that both bills—that is to say, the bill now before the Senate, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, and the amendment in

the nature of a substitute, which the minority Senators are sponsoring—go in the same direction, namely, toward greater development of the highway system, but that the difference between the two measures is mainly in the method proposed?

Mr. BUSH. I have already said there are two major differences between them.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber to hear the first part of the Senator's speech.

Mr. BUSH. The Gore bill, which is now before the Senate, provides for a 5-year program and substantially increased Federal contributions to the interstate system. Under present legislation, we are now spending \$175 million a year on the interstate system. The Gore bill proposes a 5-year program on the interstate system, the amounts for each year being, respectively, \$1 billion, \$1,225,000,000, \$1,500,000,000, and then \$2 billion for the last 2 years, or a total of \$7,725,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. That amount is for a 5-year period, is it not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes; for a 5-year period; and that will be the end of it.

It also proposes substantial increases in the amounts for primary, secondary, and urban roads. Those amounts, now approximating \$700 million, would be stepped up under the Gore bill to \$900 million, namely, \$400 million for primary roads, \$300 million for secondary roads, and \$200 million for urban roads. That is a total of \$900 million. That is a large increase, and there is serious question in the minds of officials of the Bureau of Public Roads and others whether such increases could be matched with funds by the States. They must be matched on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. WATKINS. That is under the regular road program, which has been in effect for many years.

Mr. BUSH. Yes, except that it would be stepped up under the Gore bill.

Mr. WATKINS. The States would have to match the funds, would they not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes. They would have to match the Federal funds on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the old program a State such as Utah would have to put up only 24 or 25 percent of the matching funds.

Mr. BUSH. I think the large area of public lands may enter into the calculation in the case of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true, because 77 percent or more of the acreage of Utah is owned by the United States.

Mr. BUSH. I venture to say that that accounts for the discrepancy in favor of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I wonder if that formula has been changed.

Mr. BUSH. No; that formula has not been changed. The formula remains the same as under the 1954 act, the existing legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. But the Federal expenditures which would be authorized under this bill would be stepped up.

Mr. BUSH. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. Which would require, of course, a corresponding increase in

the amounts to be contributed by the States.

Mr. BUSH. It would require an increase in the matching funds from the States. However, the participation of a State with a very high percentage of Federal lands would be reduced.

The Senator will find in Appendix A of the report, on page 47, the figures which I believe will give him the information he desires in connection with the State of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I come back to the original question. Under either of these proposals there would be a greatly stepped-up building program, largely in accordance with the recommendations of the President, at least so far as interstate road construction is concerned.

Mr. BUSH. That is true. I gave a very brief outline of the so-called Gore bill. The difference between that bill and the so-called Martin bill, which the Senator from Pennsylvania will later offer as a substitute, is that under the Martin bill, which is the President's plan, or the recommendation of the Clay committee, the proposed legislation deals only with the interstate system. It would provide a \$25 billion contribution by the Federal Government for the interstate system. It would arrange for a financing plan which would include the establishment of a Federal Highway Corporation, into which would go the gas-tax revenues of the Nation over and above \$622 million. The sum so derived from the gas tax is estimated—and the figures have not been challenged—to be sufficient to retire the \$21 billion bond issue over a period of 30 years, both as to principal and interest, the idea being that the increased mileage of roads will provide increased gas-tax revenues in sufficient amount to make the retirement of those bonds certain.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the bill provide for toll roads?

Mr. BUSH. It does not provide for any Federal toll roads. The Martin bill, as it now stands, does provide a basis whereby toll roads which are being planned or which are in existence meet the requirements of the interstate system, which are very severe—and I may say that the former Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads stated only a few days ago that he thought hardly any toll roads would meet the requirements of the system—may be incorporated into the interstate system, payment being made by the Federal Government through its Federal Highway Authority.

Mr. WATKINS. Would they then cease to be toll roads?

Mr. BUSH. They would have to cease to be toll roads. Under the present law it is impossible to charge tolls on federally aided highways.

Mr. WATKINS. That would be the ultimate objective if the toll roads were taken over.

Mr. BUSH. It would be one of the effects which must be taken into account. However, the real object would be to put into the interstate system those roads which are ready to be incorporated into it without penalizing a State which had gone ahead and built such roads with its own funds. Such roads would be taken into the interstate system and the State

would be compensated for its expenditures. A formula is provided for such compensation. The State would not be paid 100 percent. The formula takes into consideration depreciation. The fairness of the formula has not been questioned. There has been some objection to that phase of the bill which provides reimbursement to States for any toll roads which might be accepted into the interstate system.

Mr. WATKINS. Where do such objections come from?

Mr. BUSH. Such objections come from States which have no toll roads.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot understand why they should object. The system would take over roads already finished and probably not at a figure which would entirely reimburse the States but at a figure somewhat below the construction cost. I cannot understand the philosophy of the objection.

Mr. BUSH. Neither can many of us. At the governors conference, Governor Kennon, of Louisiana, and Governor Kohler, of Wisconsin, said that it was a matter of simple equity, if the Government were to take over such roads, not to penalize a State for having gone ahead in a forward-looking and progressive manner and developed its highways. Many persons feel that it is essential, in fairness, to make arrangements to take over such roads, but there is opposition to it in the committee. I do not know whether the proposal will stand up.

Mr. WATKINS. Comparing the two proposals, under which would we get the most roads?

Mr. BUSH. We would get the most roads, in my judgment, under Senate bill 1160, which is the Martin bill, because it provides a 10-year program for the completion of the interstate highway system, and also provides for raising and setting aside the money to pay for such a system. So we would be adopting a long-range plan and a system to pay for it. Thus, I think we would insure the completion of the system. One of my chief objections to the bill of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is that it would not insure the completion of the interstate system.

Mr. WATKINS. Would there be a large difference between the mileage which would be built under the Martin proposal and the mileage under the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BUSH. The interstate system calls for approximately 40,000 miles of modern highway.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the present plan of authorization.

Mr. BUSH. That is the present plan for the interstate system. It would provide 40,000 miles of highway. I believe the Gore bill would step that figure up to 42,500, the idea being to have a little more leeway in case it were needed for any presently unforeseen necessities.

Mr. WATKINS. How about the Martin bill? Does it provide for additional mileage?

Mr. BUSH. The Martin bill provides 40,000 miles. In the opinion of officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, in the Martin bill there is a sufficient cushion, at 40,000 miles, to take care of contin-

gencies which may arise. There is a difference of opinion on that point.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that, aside from the money provided for the Federal-aid system, section 6 of the Gore bill would authorize an appropriation of \$22,500,000 for forest highways for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, and \$24 million for forest development roads and trails for the same period.

Section 7 (a) provides an authorization of \$12,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks.

Section 7 (b) would also authorize the sum of \$11 million for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, for construction and maintenance of authorized parkways.

Section 7 (c) would authorize \$10 million for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations, and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands.

I know the Senator will be interested in section 8, which provides an authorization of \$2 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 through 1961, for completing sections of important Federal-aid highways lying entirely within the public domain.

Mr. WATKINS. I remember that a number of years ago Congress passed a bill which permitted the completion of Highway No. 6 through one area in Utah which consisted entirely of public lands, so that it would tie in with the already constructed portion through Nevada and California. It completed the highway as a national highway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was to take care of that kind of situation that authorization was provided in the pending bill. I would say to the Senator from Utah that the philosophy of the bill is to carry on exactly as we have heretofore.

Since 1916 we have tried to accelerate the program. That is why there have been increases in the authorization. The difference between the so-called Martin bill and the pending bill is that the Martin bill emphasizes completely the interstate system, while the Gore bill accelerates that system greatly by authorizing the expenditure of money to develop it. We realize its importance, especially since it is now a part of the national defense system highways. However, the committee did not wish to forget that there are other roads which are just as important to the American people and to national defense. Those roads are the farm-to-market, the primary, and the urban roads.

Mr. BUSH. I have the floor. Does the Senator from Utah wish to ask further questions?

Mr. WATKINS. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, made these comments, I

thought I would like to ask him another question or two. However, I do not wish to ask him the questions on the Senator's time. I thank both Senators for their courtesy.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to correct a statement which I made regarding the toll road situation. Under the Martin bill, a State has the option of either taking the money which it may get for its toll road and retiring the debt, in which case the road would become a free road, or the State may continue to operate it as a toll road and use the money for the construction of other roads in the State, under State supervision, and so forth. That is a new feature in the Martin bill which is not included in the committee bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that I was intrigued by the question which arose over the 40,000-mile limitation. I believe the Senator from Utah asked whether it would take care of additions, and the Senator from Connecticut stated that the testimony was to the effect that it would take care of contingencies.

Is it not a fact that the testimony of the representative of the Bureau of Public Roads was to the effect that there are presently designated 37,600 miles; that 2,400 miles would be largely required for taking care of urban connections, and that if there were to be any major extensions of the interstate system by the designation of additional mileage of any substance, the 2,400 miles could not be counted upon to take care of it?

Mr. BUSH. In the last discussion I had with Mr. du Pont, the special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce on road matters, and former Commissioner of the Bureau, he said he thought that there was some give and take in the cushion and that he believed it would take care of not only the urban connection situation, which the Senator mentioned, but of the additional extensions which might be necessary. For instance, the Governor of Colorado made a very interesting case for a new connection on the interstate system. I have forgotten how many miles it involves.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Utah may be able to tell us about that.

Mr. WATKINS. The Governor of Colorado proposed that an east-west highway be built from Denver, Colo., to Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. BUSH. How many miles would that be?

Mr. WATKINS. That would be more than 500 miles, as I remember.

Mr. BUSH. I am surprised that it would be that many miles.

Mr. WATKINS. I wonder whether there is any leeway for that type of mileage on an interstate highway. Can such a road get into the interstate system under either proposal?

Mr. BUSH. The Utah-Colorado road, concerning which the Senator from Utah, as well as the Governor of Colorado, Mr. Johnson, testified, is not on the interstate system.

Mr. WATKINS. How could it be incorporated into that system.

Mr. BUSH. As I am at present advised, the Senator would have to offer an amendment to accomplish that objective.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall offer an amendment to whichever proposal will make that highway possible.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Utah has confirmed my suggestion that it is time for all Senators to study very closely the issue which is now before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. That is why I am asking these questions.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the Senator for doing so.

Mr. WATKINS. I apologize for asking so many questions, the answers to which I would probably be able to obtain by studying the bill. However, as the Senator from Connecticut has so well propounded the issues involved, I thought I would ask some questions for my own information.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Utah is always welcome to ask questions whenever I have the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know what Mr. du Pont may have said in private conversation to the Senator from Connecticut. All I know is what was testified before the committee. I have before me page 677 of the hearings, at which point a quotation was placed in the record from page 72 of the report entitled "Highway Needs of the National Defense."

I read from that report:

The balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limitation is still reserved mainly to be comprised, after further detailed study, of essential circumferential and distributing routes in urban areas.

I believe the general consensus of the testimony was that the 2,400-mile cushion of the 40,000-mile authorization would largely be required for the urban connections.

Mr. BUSH. That was the intention, and the Senator is correct. I recall that. However, I shall try to have corroborated the statement with regard to the additional cushion which seems to have been found since the statement was made for the record.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to state for the benefit of the Senator from Utah that it is true that the cushion in the reported bill is exactly as the Senator from South Dakota has stated it, and the only possibility of getting extra interstate roads, and the only possibility of getting the road the Governor of Colorado thought was so much needed, would be under the extra 2,500 miles which are included in the authorization of the Gore bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that is correct.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the bill, S. 1048, change the distribution of the highway funds from the system established by the present law?

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator refer to primary, secondary, and urban highways?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To any system. Does the bill as reported by the committee change the distribution of funds allocated to any system from that provided in the present law, the act of 1954? I refer to the formula.

Mr. BUSH. No; the formula is not changed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator know whether there has been any change in the formula since the Highway Act of 1921 was adopted?

Mr. BUSH. My recollection is that a change was made by the 1954 act. However, the Senator probably knows more about that than I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The change in the 1954 act related to the interstate system. Prior to the act of 1954, the funds for the interstate system were distributed in the same way the funds for the primary system were distributed in prior years. I see the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] nodding his head. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for asking my question is that I was a bit chagrined or disappointed to find the minority views carrying this sentence:

S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss.

I think that is a very unfortunate statement to appear in the minority views, because, from the statement which the Senator has made, there has been no change in the formula or the pattern of distribution of highway funds since 1921, except last year when half of the interstate system money was put on a population basis instead of under the old formula. If the sentence is true that—

S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss.

the committee members who signed minority views containing that sentence are indicting the formula or method of fund distribution since the creation of the Highway Act of 1921. They are applying that statement to the formula which has been in effect under Republican and Democratic administrations for 30 years or more. I think it is unfortunate to have that kind of an impression spread abroad. I hope the support for the bill is not founded upon any such contention as that.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Of course, that statement is a simile. Unfortunately, we have not had a laid-out road program for the entire United States. There has been an enormous

amount of logrolling relative to it. My own State of Pennsylvania proceeded for many years without any road plan. Roads were built where there was the greatest political influence. We finally adopted the plan of connecting the county seats in Pennsylvania. Then we built lateral roads, and, as a result, we now have more paved roads than has any other State in the Union.

When I was Governor of Pennsylvania, I used to come to Washington and urge that a certain road for military purposes or economic purposes be built. Whether that was political influence I do not know, but, nevertheless, that is the way roads were built.

This bill provides a plan whereby the interstate road system as established in 1946 or 1947 will be completed in 10 years. There is no politics involved. It will actually be done. Ours is a political country, and it is pretty difficult to get away from political influences. If the governor of a State, with his highway secretary or commissioner comes to Washington, he has considerable influence; there is no question about that.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has been so helpful in connection with all road legislation, that I do not think the language he quoted was intended as an indictment. Sometimes in the rush of getting things done we make some assertions, which, if taken literally, would amount to an indictment. But the statement quoted was not intended to be an indictment of the work which has been done. I think we have done very well in the United States without a definite road plan, but I believe the time has come when we must have a plan for building interstate roads, because interstate roads connecting 42 of the 48 State capitals, will serve more than 90 percent of all the communities over 50,000 population in the Nation. It is a real plan, and is the first one we have ever had.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to comment to my friend from South Dakota, than whom I know of no more conscientious legislator, on the statement in the minority views from which he quoted. I wish to read what he has already read, and then to continue the quotation, because I think the following language explains the sentence which the Senator read. I shall amplify it a little bit.

The statement says:

S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss. These widely scattered dollars will not build those roads having the greatest national interest. They will not bring about the completion of the national system of interstate highways so vitally needed for the safety of our citizens, our national and civil defense, and our economy. They may affect votes, but they do not solve this country's road problem.

In contrast to S. 1948, the so-called Clay or administration bill, S. 1160—

Which we call the Martin bill—

accomplishes the clear-cut objective of building the interstate system within a 10-year period and financing it on a debt-liquidating basis without raising taxes. It faces vexing problems involved and solves them.

It blazes a new trail in Federal road legislation demanded by present-day conditions.

This country needs adequate highways now, not 20 years from now.

Again, the language regarding the "blunderbuss" has to do with the authorizations suggested for the primary, secondary, and urban roads which, in our opinion, the States will not be able to match. As of today, the reports from the governors of the different States indicate that so far as S. 1048 is concerned, of the States which have expressed their views, 20 say they can do it, but 10 say they cannot do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me in the way he has for comments as well as for questions, and I should like to say that I think a formula provides the only way whereby we can avoid having funds spent on a political basis. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] referred to the distribution of funds when they are once received by the States. I think it is true that in my State and in other States political pressures have determined in which of the counties road money should be spent, but the fact that the Federal Government has had a precise formula during the past 30 years that has meant that a certain amount of money has gone to roadbuilding under a Republican administration under precisely the same conditions as it would have gone under a Democratic administration. The money has gone to South Dakota under a Democratic administration precisely as it would have gone under a Republican administration. Now we have a precise formula under which funds are allocated to all the States on the same fixed basis; but if we change that and make the allocation of funds available in the discretion of and according to the whims of a corporate board which is not responsible to the Congress, pressures and politics can and may creep into the distribution of highway funds. Then we would have Federal dollars scattered over the country as though shot from a blunderbuss. The guaranty against having highway dollars spent on a blunderbuss political basis is a precise formula written into the law under which road funds are distributed among the several States.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think anyone objects to a formula for distributing funds to the primary, secondary, and urban road systems as it has been the case in the past. I think the point is whether we are going to have an interstate highway system and whether it is essential to adopt a plan which will assure the completion of the system as soon as is possible. That is the basic difference in the philosophies of the two bills.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think possibly that interpretation has suggested itself to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut because the Gore bill was limited to 5 years.

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that the Gore bill has so substantially stepped up the primary, secondary, and urban authorizations that I do not believe it will be practical for the States will be unable to match the payments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill I introduced, S. 1573, was based upon a 10-year authorization program, but it also proposed that at the end of 5 years the distribution of funds for the interstate system would possibly be subject to change on the basis of need, in order that the system might be completed. So far as I am concerned, I think it might be a desirable change in the committee bill as reported to add the other 5 years, and to provide that during the second 5 years the distribution shall be upon the ratio of uncompleted mileage of the interstate system. That would insure the completion of the system, as the Senator from Connecticut seems to desire.

But I think all who feel that the interstate system should be stepped up ought to take note of the fact that until 1952 there was no regular authorization for the interstate system. The act of 1952 provided for a \$25 million annual authorization for the interstate system. In the act of 1954, that amount was stepped up 7 times. It was increased from \$25 million to \$175 million.

Under the committee bill, it is proposed to step up the amount to \$1 billion in the first year, to \$1,250,000,000 in the second year, to \$1,500,000,000 in the third year, and to \$2 billion in the fourth year and \$2 billion in the fifth year.

The rate of expenditure for the interstate system, under the committee bill, is substantially that which is outlined on the annual basis in the report of the Clay Committee.

So I do not see that there is so much difference, so far as the building of the interstate system is concerned, provided we extend or project the plan for 10 years, the same as was done in the previous act.

It may be that we should plan for 10 years; but a majority of the committee thought that after 5 years the program should be examined to see where we were. Personally, I would have been glad to see a 10-year authorization for the interstate program from the start, along the lines of the bill I introduced, and have the second 5 years based upon the ratio of uncompleted mileage in the system.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to read, from the middle of page 36, a portion of the minority views, as follows:

(a) The allocation of Federal funds is based on actual needs.

S. 1160 recognizes the indisputable fact that the way to get the interstate system is to pay for it. Therefore, it permits the allocation of funds to the various States on the basis of their actual needs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Who will determine the actual needs?

Mr. BUSH. The statement continues:

It recognizes that the cost of construction substantially varies from State to State because of the differences in mileage, terrain, traffic, and various other factors.

In the past, formulas were developed seeking to permit an equitable distribution of Federal dollars to the States. The objective of S. 1160 is not the apportionment of Federal dollars, but rather the construction of a nationally important system of highways. Accordingly, a formula merely distributing dollars is neither warranted nor workable. The absence of such a formula affords no

basis for a charge of favoritism of one State over another, since the 37,600 miles of the system were designated many years ago pursuant to legislative mandate, and long before there was any thought of a plan such as the present one. The system is laid out from a national viewpoint and on a basis of the economic and defense needs of the entire country.

That is the philosophy behind Senate bill 1160.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to make an additional point? I certainly appreciate his courtesy in yielding. He has been very generous, because I am not asking questions.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator from South Dakota is helping to develop the points which all of us are seeking to develop. I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If there were ever a better prescription offered for setting up and distributing highway funds in such a way as to permit political pressures to operate, I have never seen it better stated than in the sentence which the Senator read, as follows:

S. 1160 * * * recognizes that the cost of construction substantially varies from State to State because of the differences in mileage, terrain, traffic, and various other factors.

In other words, the allocation of funds would be left to the discretion of persons who had the money to distribute. It is always possible for politically potent persons to say that "It costs more to build roads in my district"; or "This is the most important mileage to have constructed."

That is where we see the basis for the political distribution of highway funds. That is the blunderbuss distribution.

To be sure, the terrain, traffic, and mileage differ in various localities; but if the distribution is left to discretion, then the way is opened to personal presentation; and personal presentation means an opportunity for favoritism.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from South Dakota has had more experience in these matters, I think, than has the Senator from Connecticut; but I believe he will agree that the interstate system was laid out on a basis that was not political. It was laid out with the cooperation of the States in an effort to create a system which would be in the national interest.

So far as I have been able to learn, no great political pressures have been exercised as to which States were to be included in the interstate system. That system was planned in an earnest desire to provide a network of roads which would connect the principal centers of population, and also to promote interstate commerce and safe travel.

Furthermore, since that system was laid out, we now have to consider the very important items of national defense and civil defense, especially with reference to the evacuation of our cities in the event of an attack. That is one of the most considerable factors in connection with the whole question, and is one of the reasons why it is desirable to adopt a plan which will result in the development of an interstate system which will be in the interest of everybody.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I agree that the interstate system calls for a somewhat different approach than do the other systems when it comes to a distribution of funds. The RECORD will show that a year ago, when the Federal Highway Act of 1954 was being debated, I was one of those who supported changing the formula so that 50 percent would be allotted on a population basis, because it seemed to me that that would bring about the completion of the interstate system. But there, again, a definite formula was provided. Half the money was to be distributed on the basis of population. The formula was precise. It did not come within the discretion of any person to allot the money. The Bureau of Public Roads had a precise formula.

I have been told by Mr. duPont—or at least I think I got the impression from him in conversation, but I do not want to hold him to this—that the population formula would not be too bad for the apportionment of funds for the interstate system. It may be that the allotment should be 100 percent on that basis. But Congress made that one change last year, and it was precise. It did not leave the distribution of the funds to the discretion of individual persons in Democratic States or Republican States. The States retained their apportionment regardless of which party was in power.

Mr. BUSH. During the hearings and during the committee's deliberations on the bill, was any question raised about the validity of the interstate system?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know that there was, although I think I made reference to the fact that when provision was made for the interstate system, a great many States tried to have too many miles designated in the interstate system, the reason being that the allotments for the interstate system were so much higher than they were for the other roads of the primary system, and the States did not want to be called upon to put up too much money, because they had too many roads to build. That was when the formula was on a 50-50 matching basis, and the States would have had to use too much of their own money to build roads to the interstate standard.

So the selection of roads for the interstate system was not made on the basis of the best interests of the country or of the needs of national defense. No designation was made on the basis of national defense.

The designation was made upon the requests of State highway commissions. Those commissions made requests of the Federal Works Agency, which was headed by General Fleming. I believe the certification of the routes for the interstate system, as published in that year, will show the signature of General Fleming as head of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. BUSH. I simply comment that during the hearings the committee heard the testimony of representatives of the governors' conference and the American Municipal Association, whose membership includes some 12,000 of the principal cities of the United States, and all of them seemed to have endorsed the principle of the interstate highway sys-

tem and favored its development as soon as possible. I know of no evidence or testimony which was offered to the contrary during the hearings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Connecticut does remember, does he not, that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and I think also the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—

Mr. BUSH. And Governor Johnson. Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And Governor Johnson, were all before the committee urging the designation of some additional mileage?

Mr. BUSH. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure that had it been generally thought there would be some additional mileage, there would have been officials from other States making representations on that score, too. That would have been because they felt there was some deficiency in the designation of 1947.

Mr. BUSH. I shall certainly accept the Senator's correction, if it is a correction, that they wanted an addendum to the interstate system between Utah and Colorado, and made a very stirring appeal for that particular extension; but so far as the interstate system as a whole was concerned, the desirability of the policy was not brought into question. On the contrary, it seemed to be very widely endorsed by representatives of the governments of all the States who came to talk with the committee about it. I thought the desirability of an interstate system as such received unqualified endorsement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly agree with the Senator from Connecticut that there was strong endorsement of the need of the system and the desirability of expediting its completion. I merely submit that under either of the proposals the interstate system would be expanded far out of proportion to anything previously proposed. It went from nothing to \$25 million; from \$25 million to \$175 million; from \$175 million up to a minimum of \$1 billion. I call attention to the fact that the \$1 billion which S. 1048 proposes for the interstate system in the first year is the equivalent of what the Federal Government provided for all categories of roads under the act of 1954, which itself was a vast step up from 1952.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: I should like to add to the remarks I made earlier when I was interrogating the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. I did not know he was going to conclude his remarks at the time he did. A former Member of the Senate stopped at my desk and diverted my attention momentarily. To the Senator from Connecticut is due a great deal of credit for the attitude in the committee that greater emphasis should be on the interstate system. I believe that the interest, the argument, the questions, and the study which the Senator from Connecticut devoted to this subject were in large part responsible for the decision of the com-

mittee to increase the funds proposed for the interstate system under S. 1048. The bill as originally introduced proposed \$500 million for the interstate system. The committee increased that amount to \$1 billion in the first 3 years and to \$2 billion in the fourth and fifth years.

I may disagree with the Senator from Connecticut on some of the methods of arriving at the goal I have in mind, but it is a common goal.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to acknowledge most gratefully the very generous comments made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that my name appears as one of the signers of the minority views on the pending bill, reported by the Committee on Public Works, I would not be taking any of the time of the Senate to discuss it today.

As a comparatively new Member of this body, I have been very sparing of words in what I have had to say in the Senate, and I shall continue to be in the future for a considerable period of time.

Furthermore, I was not a member of the subcommittee which considered the highway bill, but the full committee, of which I am a member, deliberated long and seriously upon it. As one of the three Senators whose names appear on the minority views, I desire to make a brief statement to the Senate at this time, so that it may appear in the RECORD along with the very able statements made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. President, in his very able speech to the Senate this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was, as I observed earlier today, very fair and very generous not only in admitting but in emphasizing that, whatever legislation may finally result from the pending measure proposing a new and ambitious and far-reaching national highway system, it will have been in large part caused by the work, the study, and the report of the Clay Committee, and by the insistent request and message of the President of the United States, which served to arouse the country and direct the attention of the Congress to the need of approaching this great problem in a new and far more sweeping and thorough manner than in the past.

I think, Mr. President, that those of us who in some measure disagree with the report of a majority of the Committee on Public Works should emulate the spirit which has been exemplified by the able Senator from Tennessee and other Senators. So far as I am concerned—and I am quite confident it is true of my associates—there is no pride of authorship. When, after the regular legislative process of this body and the other body in the Capitol, and of the committees of the Congress, it makes little difference whether the final result is the Gore bill or the administration bill, whether it bears the number S. 1048 or S. 1160. What we are all interested in is the development of a plan for a highway system which will meet new and widespread

conditions in a thoroughgoing manner and not by halfway measures.

That being the case, Mr. President, it occurs to me that the first determination which the Senate has to make, and which every individual Senator must make in his own mind in considering this question is, How urgent is the need from the standpoint of national defense, from the standpoint of national safety, and from the standpoint of dealing with the ever-increasing traffic problems in this country.

If the conclusions of the Clay Committee, which have been endorsed by a message from the President of the United States, overemphasize or overstate the problem, then our whole attitude should of necessity be changed. In other words, Mr. President, if it be true that the United States is now faced with a new and serious and dreadful danger of atomic war and of massive attack which makes it necessary to have means of transportation and communication and escape on a scale we have never even contemplated before, then we must lay all the emphasis, or at least a great part of the emphasis, on the proposal for a national system of interstate highways, even though in the case of many States it may entail—and let us face the fact that, of course, it does entail—some sacrifice on their part in dealing with their own secondary systems and country roads.

If it be true that the death rate on our highways has so increased that the number is 36,000 a year, and that the construction of limited-access arteries of communication throughout the country is necessary to solve that problem, at least to the extent of holding down the casualties which seem to be mounting year by year, then again we must face this question with a certain determination in our own minds that we shall devote a large part of our activities to the interstate system, even at some sacrifice.

Mr. President, if it also be true that the traffic situation has become so complex that our economy cannot expand sufficiently to enable our country, which we love so much, to grow, and to permit the standard of living of every American citizen to continue to improve, unless we provide the roads upon which the wheels of commerce may move, then we are called upon to face this issue in a very definite manner.

Mr. President, if those conclusions are overdrawn, and if the situation is not quite so imperative from the standpoint of national defense and civil defense as we have been led to believe, then obviously we would prefer to continue to have the emphasis placed upon permitting the States to continue to build their highways with whatever Federal aid we can give them, and to leave in the hands of the States the determination of the matter. It is not a question of politics, in my opinion, Mr. President. It is not a question of shooting dollars from a blunderbuss. On the contrary, the question is, What shall be the underlying, motivating factor in connection with our highway system in the next few years?

Mr. President, let me speak for a moment—as I assume other Senators do occasionally—with some attention to my

own section of the country. The first civil-defense district of the United States includes New England, New York, and New Jersey. In that civil-defense district reside 30 million Americans at the present time. Twenty-two million of them live in areas which have been designated as critical areas, areas of defense production, areas which will be targets for attack in case of war. It is highly imperative that means of escape, means of moving that population, should it become necessary to move them, be provided, and be provided as rapidly and as completely as possible. It is equally important that sufficient highways and main arteries of the proper type be constructed, so that not only may the population be moved out, but also that troops, guns, and other equipment may be moved in in case of attack on the eastern seaboard. I use that as an example to indicate that my reason for signing my name to the minority views and for joining my associates in the minority views and in endorsing Senate bill 1160 is, not that I think that bill is perfect, or not that I think Senate bill 1048 is not a good measure, but that I have reached the conclusion that the underlying theory necessary to be followed at this time is better exemplified in Senate bill 1160 than in Senate bill 1048, which has been endorsed by a majority of the committee.

Mr. President, I am very fond of reading the philosophy of a Chinese writer or philosopher whose writings some of my colleagues have likewise read, I am sure. His name is Lin Yutang, and he has made some very humble and very interesting observations, which he has illustrated very well, indeed. One which has lingered in my mind is as follows: In one of his writings, he contrasts how things are done in America with how things are done in China. He says, "In America, when you build a tunnel beneath a river, you have one crew begin to dig from one side of the river, and you have another crew begin to dig from the other side of the river. They follow plans which are laid down and charted by the best engineering skill you can produce. At some time the two tunnels meet. If, when they meet, they fail to meet squarely, even by a fraction of a foot, you Americans regard it as a disgrace and as an engineering failure. But," says he, "in China, if we are to dig a tunnel under a river, we have one crew begin on one bank of the river, and we have another crew begin on the other bank. Sometimes they meet, but sometimes they do not meet at all. If they do not meet at all, they simply continue their work, and then we have two good tunnels." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not think there is need for heat regarding the statement about the use of a blunderbuss. If we are living in an age when we do not need to be alert and ready for every possible emergency which may develop, then it would be far better that neither of these bills pass, and it would be far better that the Federal Government surrender to the States some of the gasoline taxes the Federal Government now is taking from the States, and thus let the States

build their own highways in the way they wish to build them.

But if we are facing a situation in which it is highly necessary that the "tunnels," so to speak, meet; if we are facing a situation in which it is highly necessary not to have one plan in one State and a different plan in another State; if we are facing a situation in which it is highly necessary that, even at some sacrifice, there be an integrated, coordinated national system of interstate highways for defense purposes, then, regardless of whether we amend the Gore bill or whether we substitute the so-called administration bill, or whether we combine the two, it is my belief that we must place the emphasis squarely on the interstate highways. By doing so, we shall release and relinquish certain assets to the States, because the Federal Government will then be building the most expensive highways with which the States have to cope, and thus the resources of the States will be left, at least in greater proportion for use in solving their other highway problems.

So, Mr. President, I say that the first question we must ask ourselves is whether we need a national system of interstate highways for national defense and national safety and national traffic.

The next question we should ask ourselves is whether we wish to have that system completed.

As a matter of fact, the bill reported by the committee is ably conceived, and is directed toward that objective. But, Mr. President, in reaching my own decision, I was greatly swayed by the facts which have been brought out so well by my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush], who has pointed out that a 10-year program, carefully rounded out, one which begins somewhere and finishes somewhere, one which not only is based on a national system, but also provides for its ultimate completion, or at least for its substantial completion, is imperative. Not only is it imperative from the standpoint of defense, from the standpoint of permitting the States to anticipate and to plan in advance, and for the purpose of making it possible for machinery to be bought and for the tools to be provided with which to carry on highway work over an extended period, but it is even more necessary because the added revenue to be derived from the rising tide of traffic on these national arteries will not be tapped, nor will it be available, unless we finish them. If we build only a part of the system, it is like throwing a stout rope to a drowning man, but a rope not quite long enough to reach him. When we base our hope of financing this project without breaking the backs of the American people largely on the carefully estimated and carefully calculated increased returns which would come from this kind of national system, it is a condition precedent that we must finish the system. Otherwise we shall not get even a substantial part of the benefit of the increased income.

Of course, there is involved the practical question as to whether the States can match the funds required for the system contemplated by the committee

bill. One of the gratifying things about this entire issue in the committee—and I am sure the same situation will prevail on the floor of the Senate—was that we dealt frankly and honestly with this subject, and in entire frankness with one another. I know that my colleagues are entirely sincere when they say that many States would not be able to match the funds provided for in the committee bill. I think many States feel at the present moment that they would not be able to match those funds. It is my own guess—and it is based entirely upon personal conjecture, after having served many years in the State legislature, and knowing something of the way things work in the States, as do all Senators—that when the time comes very few States will fail to find the means, somehow, to match the Federal funds provided in the committee bill.

But, Mr. President, if they do it, many States will do it at such sacrifice, and will tie up so many of their resources, that they will feel the pinch in every last State activity, including public education, and other demands upon the States.

It is always argued in the States, no matter what kind of goal is set, that "we must match all these funds. We must get our full share, because if we do not, we shall be paying taxes for the entire program, and some other State will get a greater share than we get unless we take advantage of the entire program." That is true. So, even though States do so at a sacrifice, even though it may mean the issuing of bonds, even though it may mean going further into debt, even though it may mean slighting some of the other necessary services, the States strain every nerve to meet the burden involved in matching Federal funds.

That is why I feel, as a practical matter, that a less accelerated plan, definitely spreading over 10 years, without the matching requirements of the committee bill, would in the long run be fairer and better for the States, and, by the same token, for the country as a whole.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his frank statement in regard to the probable situation so far as concerns the States matching the proposed allocations under Senate bill 1048, which are larger than those under the present law.

I point out that, as Senate bill 1048 was originally introduced, it proposed a total of \$1,100,000,000 for the categories of primary, secondary, and urban roads. The responses which the committee received from its inquiry as to whether or not the States could match were based, of course, upon the prospective allocations under a total for those categories of \$1,100,000,000. The bill as reported provides \$900 million for those categories, which represents a drop of \$200 million from the original figure in Senate bill 1048.

I may state, if the Senator will permit, that in offering the amendment which I offered to reduce the figure from \$1,100,000,000 to \$900 million, I used the argument that a jump from the present level of \$700 million up to \$1,100,000,000 was too great a jump. The \$70 million under the present law represents a jump from \$550 million under the 1952 act. I thought that if we encouraged the States to go up to \$900 million, that would be about as much as they could do. But I thought we were warranted in giving them some encouragement, because, as I read the report of the Clay Committee, it did not confine itself to urging completion of the interstate system. It contemplated a program of \$101 billion to complete all the systems. The recommendation of the Clay Committee was that we seek to complete the secondary system, the primary system, and the urban system, although the bill which was introduced would impliedly leave such completion to the States. Senate bill 1048, as proposed to be amended by the committee, provides some leadership, some incentive, some encouragement to the States, to do something in the other categories.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his contribution. I thoroughly agree with nearly everything he has said. I thought his amendment was a good amendment, a valuable amendment, and that it improved the bill as originally introduced.

I cannot quite admit that his statements are complete. When we talk about providing incentive and encouragement to the States, I am reminded that over the years I have heard the words "incentive" and "encouragement" used again and again. Usually, when it is all boiled down and reduced to the least common denominator, in addition to the incentive and encouragement, which are very harmless and sweet-sounding words, there is a little spurt, a little element of forcing the States into a situation in which they must match the funds of the Federal Government or face the fact that they are relinquishing some right which some other States enjoy, partly at their expense. That is fundamental. I believe in matching funds. I think great good has been accomplished by that system. I am not condemning it. There is no great good without some evil. But holding out funds to the States for them to match is a weak point in this program, because it usually results—particularly in the poorer States, or the States which have no great financial resources—in unbalanced budgets, because of pressure from the Federal Government.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that I have suggested, first, that in deciding what our attitude should be on this question we should ask ourselves: Do we need a national system of highways for national defense, for national safety, and for the solution of the national traffic problem? Secondly, we should ask ourselves: Do we need the system to be coordinated and made complete and joint as between the States? Third, we should ask ourselves: Do we want this system completed?

Now I should like to suggest one more question, which I believe is perhaps the most important and most practical question of all. We should ask ourselves: Do we want this system started?

Mr. President, as a practical proposition—and this is the main reason I have affixed my signature to the minority view—the so-called administration bill, S. 1160, does provide a method of financing the project.

Let us again be perfectly frank. Certainly I, with my limited knowledge of the subject—and I believe other Senators also, with a great deal more knowledge than I have of the subject—would hesitate to assert or predict or guarantee that the financing will work out just as it has been calculated to do.

Furthermore, I have a good deal of sympathy for some Members of the Senate who do not like the provision creating a special corporation which would issue special bonds. They have the feeling that in so doing, as we say in New England, we would be beating the Devil around the bush or trying to run the country into debt without extending the debt limit. I can understand and appreciate the feelings of some Senators whom I have admired during my service in the other body.

However, first, I should like to say that when the Government expends money for a national system of highways it is different from almost any other Federal expenditure. When we build a veterans' hospital or when we build a housing project or when we expend money for many of the activities which the Federal Government supports, it is a grant, it is assistance to a worthy cause, but it is not a business investment. On the other hand, when we expend money on a national system of highways which will enable our expanding economy further to develop, it is a business investment. I, for one, do not regard it as either legally or morally dishonest to create a special bond issue to be paid off by the users of the system of highways.

Secondly, I suggest that S. 1160, the bill which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I are sponsoring, certainly prescribes definite methods of financing the system. The committee bill does not attempt in any way to suggest the financing.

All of us who have served in Congress, in either House, know what happens as a practical proposition when a legislative committee authorizes an expenditure, particularly an expenditure so vast as this one, and then drops the matter in the lap of the Committee on Appropriations and says, "Gentlemen, you find the money."

I venture to suggest—and this is my greatest objection to the committee bill and the most impelling reason why I am supporting S. 1160—that if we go through all the motions and all the fanfare and adopt the committee bill, and then send word to the country that we have embarked on a great and ambitious system of national highways, and drop it in the lap of the committee which must recommend appropriations for it, without even suggesting how it is to be

done—and this is no reflection on the Committee on Appropriations but rather a compliment to them—when we get all through we will come out the same hole we went in. We will have only a slightly accelerated highway program such as we have been having all the time.

Therefore, it is my deep conviction that the passage of the committee bill in its present form is a beautiful gesture, but it will not build highways.

I wish to leave a quotation with the Senate. It is from Daniel H. Burnham, the famous architect who designed the Columbian Exposition, the Marshall Field store in Chicago, and the Union Station in Washington. He said:

Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency.

Mr. President, let us not merely make a gesture, which may soon prove to be futile and idle; but, facing as we are the emergency of our generation, let us meet this challenge head on and make big plans and embark upon an ambitious program designed to meet the requirements which must be met. I believe that S. 1160, which embodies the plan advocated by the President of the United States and is based on the definite recommendations of the Clay Committee, more nearly meets the challenge than does the committee bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, my attention was attracted by what the Senator said regarding what might happen to the authorizations proposed in S. 1048 and the implied suggestion that in some way S. 1160 would meet the situation by assuring that funds would be available. How does the Senator suggest that S. 1160 would assure that funds would be available, while S. 1048 would not?

Mr. COTTON. I think I very carefully said that I could not, would not, and did not guarantee that the method of financing suggested in Senate bill 1160 would be adopted, or, if adopted, would work to the queen's taste. What I tried to say was that it presents a definite program which I have faith to believe will commend itself to the Congress, and which I am inclined to believe will be successful. The other bill presents nothing. I do not guarantee that it will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May it not be an illusory hope?

Mr. COTTON. It could be an illusory hope, but I happen to be one who believes it would not be. I would rather have some hope than no hope at all. Even though the committee bill is a good bill—and I agree with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, with whom I served on the Appropriations Committee of the House, and who has a fine grasp of these matters, that in some respects it is a good bill—I still believe,

for myself, that when we drop into the hopper a great highway program with no suggestion of how to finance it, there is not as much hope as there would be if there were a definite means of financing it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I suggest to the very able Senator that under the Highway Authorization Act for a number of years, when apportionment is made, the law provides that that constitutes a commitment, and the States can proceed under the apportionment. The fear I have with respect to S. 1160 is that it insures something more than a hope only if we take over the functions of the Appropriations Committee.

If there is no guaranty of appropriations under either bill, that is one thing; but if the Senator from New Hampshire is suggesting that S. 1160 provides some plan, he is suggesting that the Senate consider a bill under which, if passed, we would have to take over the functions of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not take any more time than to say this in reply to the distinguished Senator: I grant that when we pass a bill which authorizes a certain commitment—and we are taught in New England, where the Yankees live, that we cannot get blood out of a stone—when we launch ourselves on a new program with such vast expenditures as are required by this program, there comes a time when they may not be met, and that would cause an expansion of the Federal debt.

This is not an attempt, as I understand, of the Committee on Public Works to usurp the functions of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is an attempt, following a plan of which great study has been made, to point the way, to find the means to meet the problems which the bill attempts to meet.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield on that point?

Mr. COTTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator from New Hampshire ever heard of any authorization bill or legislation suggesting to the Committee on Ways and Means or to the Committee on Finance of the Senate as to how the authorization is to be carried out?

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have heard of many instances of corporations—and we have a long line of Government corporations—having been established by action of the Congress on recommendation of committees. I do not consider that is either a recommendation or an attempt to dictate to the Committee on Ways and Means or to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator knows as well as I do that the suggestion was made that we recommend to the Committee on Finance how this was to be done, but because of precedent and because it would be unfair for the committee to recommend any legislation to another outstanding committee, we did not do it.

Mr. COTTON. And rightly so. But I still say that our bill provides through the creation of a corporation a self-liquidating plan.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. And it also provides that of the \$21 billion to be spent by the corporation, \$11 billion will be paid in interest.

SELECTION OF DR. PAUL S. WRIGHT, OF OREGON, AS LEADER OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of Oregon take great pride in the fact that the Reverend Dr. Paul S. Wright, himself the son of a missionary, has been named the spiritual leader of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. Dr. Wright is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Portland, Oreg., where I live.

Dr. Wright is a humanitarian, a man of liberal views, a religious leader broad in vision. I have heard Dr. Wright speak many times. His personality and magnetism are instantly evident. He does not deal in clichés and generalities. He applies the great teachings of the Scriptures to the day-to-day problems confronting our Nation and the world.

Although I am not of Dr. Wright's faith, I should like to congratulate his church upon selecting as its leader in the country a man so qualified from the standpoint of citizenship, ideals, and religious training.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1955, describing the choice of Dr. Paul S. Wright to be leader of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESBYTERIANS PICK WRIGHT AS CHURCH MODERATOR

LOS ANGELES, May 19.—Dr. Paul S. Wright, of Portland, Oreg., son of a missionary, was elected today to lead the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Dr. Wright, 59, takes over the highest honorary position in the church of more than 2½ million members, 1 of 3 Presbyterian groups.

He leads the week-long 167th general assembly which opened this morning.

Dr. Wright was chosen over Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. The vote was 510 to 393.

The new moderator was born in Tabriz, Iran, and came to America when he was 15. He attended Wooster College in Ohio and the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, graduating in 1922. Since 1941 he has been pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Portland.

Dr. Wright's predecessor, Dr. Ralph Waldo Lloyd, president of Maryville (Tenn.) College, asked the general assembly to approve entry of women into the ministry and to press harder for its nonsegregation doctrines.

In 1929 and 1946 the assembly approved admitting women as ministers but the local churches, which have the final word, overruled the action.

Dr. Lloyd also called for an increase in church pioneering throughout the world and in higher education.

On nonsegregation, Dr. Lloyd observed: "Our official pronouncements calling for a nonsegregated society and a nonsegregated church are strong and right. But our practice is weaker than our pronouncements. It is time for every congregation to become a true Christian pioneer. There should be no church whose doors and hearts are closed to any sincere seeker after Christ."

FLEXIBLE VERSUS RIGID PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the basic legislation for the stabilization of farm prices and incomes which was passed by the 83d Congress is the Agricultural Act of 1954, which provides for a flexible price-support program on the basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts. This law, which became effective on January 1, 1955, will become operative with the 1955 crops which have not yet been harvested.

In light of the action taken in the House of Representatives some 2 weeks ago to repeal the flexible price-support program, and the pressure being brought to get the Senate Agriculture Committee to hold hearings and report a 90-percent price-support bill, I feel obliged to bring to the Senate's attention, Mr. President, a few matters with respect to the results of the 90-percent rigid price program now in operation. In this respect, my remarks are based upon the detailed statement on agricultural policies and programs contained in my supplemental views on the report of the Joint Committee on the 1955 Economic Report of the President, in which I was joined by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and Representative WOLCOTT.

It should be recognized that the price-support levels now in effect for the 1954 crops of basic commodities, which are now still being marketed, are based on the rigid 90-percent price-support law. Quite to the contrary to what some proponents of the 90-percent rigid price-support program have been telling the public, therefore, the present difficulties cannot be attributed to the flexible price-support provision of the Agricultural Act of 1954, but to the rigid 90-percent price-support legislation which has been in effect since the early years of World War II. This 90-percent rigid price-support legislation has utterly failed to prevent the decline in farm prices for which its proponents are now attempting to hold Secretary Benson and the Eisenhower administration responsible.

As Martin Gainsbrugh, Chief Economist, National Industrial Conference Board, told the joint committee:

I would say the ills and evils of agriculture now are directly attributable to the policies that were pursued in terms of rigid support, in terms of overexpansion of agriculture in the earlier years. * * * We gave them a while to readjust postwar levels of consumption. We also gave them rigid supports for the basic commodities. We recognized that the prices of agricultural commodities would be driven up in World War II. We wanted maximum production for the farms, and we pledged for a period of years after World War II we would continue to support agricultural prices at levels above their warrant relative to the current market. Production did not come down to market levels. It did not adjust to existing levels of demand (hearings, pp. 69-70).

During World War II, abnormal domestic and foreign demand for these agricultural commodities gave American farmers prices the likes of which they had never before enjoyed. Under the impact of postwar inflation and a still

strong export demand, farm income rose from the wartime peak of \$12 billion in 1944 to a postwar peak of \$15.6 billion in 1948. But during the period 1945-49, agricultural production outside the United States had almost completely regained prewar production levels and actually exceeded them in many areas. The result was a sharp drop in American exports of agricultural commodities, accompanied by a sharp decline in farm income in 1949 to \$13.6 billion and \$12.4 billion in 1950.

But then along came the Korean war in 1950, which, as did World War II, provided an abnormal market demand for agricultural commodities, and farm income rose to \$14.5 billion in 1951. From 1951 on, there was a steady decline in farm income to \$13.6 billion in 1952, \$13.3 billion in 1953, and \$12 billion in 1954.

The conclusions to be drawn from these historical facts are simply these:

First. The increase in farm income during World War II was due to the tremendous increase in the market demand for agricultural commodities. This is evidenced by the fact that in most cases the parity price for farm commodities was over 100 percent of parity while the price-support guaranty was only 90 percent. This was the work of the law of supply and demand, since increased demand resulted in high prices and brought forth an increase in production, which meant that both farm prices and incomes increased.

Second. Except at the very early stages of World War II, rigid 90-percent price support, therefore, was not responsible for increased production. Neither have rigid 90-percent price supports been able to stop the decline in farm prices, and, therefore, farm income since the abnormal wartime demand disappeared. Since with a decrease in demand 90-percent rigid supports have induced farmers to produce more than could be consumed and as a result the parity prices of farm commodities have dropped consistently below parity and with them farm income.

Third. Rigid 90-percent price supports, therefore, have caused American farmers to produce largely for Government storage, not consumption. For example, we have on hand for the current marketing year an alltime record supply of 1,872 million bushels of wheat. At the present rate of consumption, this unprecedented supply is enough to meet our domestic and export requirements for more than 2 full years. As of February 15, 1955, 43.8 percent of the 1954 wheat crop had been placed under loan. If, for example, mandatory rigid price support at 90 percent of parity were the solution to our wheat problem, we would have no problem. But the fact is we have a serious wheat problem, and it was under the 90-percent rigid price-support law that the present difficulties developed.

The August 1, 1954, carryover of cotton was 9.7 million bales. The 1954 crop produced 13.5 million bales, giving us a total supply for the 1954 marketing year of 23.2 million bales. This is enough cotton to meet our domestic needs and foreseeable exports for 1½ years.

The August 1, 1954, carryover of rice was 7.5 million hundredweight. The 1954 crop produced 59 million hundred-

weight, giving us a total supply for the 1954 marketing year of 66.5 million hundredweight. This is enough rice to meet our domestic needs and foreseeable exports for 1½ years.

Another argument being continually advanced in favor of 90-percent rigid price supports these days runs something like this: Since the average per capita income of the farm population is but one-half that of the nonfarm population, it is imperative that the total income aggregate of the farm population not be permitted to decline further, and that a 90-percent rigid price-support program will not only prevent such a decline but also will increase the total income going to the farm population.

However, as further analysis will show, this argument will not stand up under critical examination.

From the above discussion, it is already evident that following both World War II and the Korean war 90-percent rigid price-support programs did not prevent a decline in the total income going to the farm population, when as in each case an abnormal wartime demand returned to prewar levels plus the natural increase due to population increases. According to the Farm Income Situation, released by the Department of Agriculture on March 4, 1955, the average income per capita of the farm population for 1954 was \$918 compared with the average income per capita income of the nonfarm population of \$1,836. It is obvious that the per capita income of the farm population is exactly one-half that of the nonfarm population, and, at first glance, these statistics would seem to support the position of those who earnestly believe that a rigid 90-percent price-support program will improve this ratio between the per capita income of farm and nonfarm people. However, there are several basic reasons why 90-percent rigid price-support programs have not and will not improve this relationship.

The latest figures indicate that we have a farm population of some 21.9 million persons—about 13.5 percent of the total population of 162 million—actively engaged in farming as a vocation. These people live on approximately 5¼ million farms of which more than two-thirds are tenant operated.

In 1940 there were more than 3 million farms—more than half of all the farms in the country—from which the average value of products produced was only \$700. In 1945, 80 percent of our marketable crop value was produced by one-third of our farms, 16 percent by the middle third, and the remaining 4 percent by the lowest one-third. If adjustments are made for inflationary effects, the position on this score has not altered very much during the past 10 years. In 1948 almost 43 percent, or over 2½ million farms, were too small to yield a satisfactory level of living for their occupants, producing only 6 percent of the gross farm income. This, mind you, in a year which saw the total farm income aggregate at the postwar peak of \$15,600,000,000.

What significant conclusions can be drawn from these figures? Every witness who appeared before the joint committee with respect to agricultural policy

drew the same conclusions. In this respect, for example, Dr. William S. Nicholls, professor of agricultural economics, Vanderbilt University, concluded:

Unfortunately, given the unsatisfactory nature of national employment statistics, such people are considered fully employed although at best their employment is part time and very unproductive. Their inclusion among America's farmworkers also pulls down the farm income per worker or per capita to levels which compare very unfavorably with nonfarm income, lending support to public farm policies which help them hardly at all while concealing the need for a positive public program, largely nonagricultural in nature, to alleviate their low state of productivity and income.

The magnitude and difficulties of the low-income rural problem in the United States almost staggers the imagination * * *.

In tackling the problem of rural poverty, we must first recognize that there are far more American families trying to make a living from farming than our agricultural resources can possibly support at a level of living comparable with that afforded by similar nonfarm occupations. Second, we must at long last recognize that, while primarily benefiting those farm families which are least in need of public financial aid, our agricultural price-support policies can contribute practically nothing to a solution of rural poverty (hearings, p. 598).

Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago, told the committee:

But we have really now for a decade just been talking and talking around and not coming to grips with this low-income group in agriculture. We have thought we could do it with price supports, but the problem is deeper. * * * This means you have to do more than parity prices. I am not afraid of having prices on a head 100 percent or some fraction of real values which can be put before the farmer so he can make plans accordingly. * * * Therefore, I am not against parity prices if these prices have meaning, if they have long-run value. Then we can bring much greater certainty to farming as it deserves and there will be much greater efficiency. But let me repeat, the really small poor farmer, 1 million and more, we do not get at in prices (hearings, p. 629).

Plainly, here is not only the answer as to why 90-percent rigid price support will not narrow the gap between the average per capita incomes of the farm and nonfarm populations, but also a very clear and astounding presentation of the basic or No. 1 problem confronting American agriculture: Too many small, inefficient farming units and too many people in agriculture. It is plain that its cause does not have one thing to do with whether farm prices are supported or not, or whether they are supported at 75 percent of parity, 90 percent of parity, or 100 percent of parity.

It is evident then that the chief beneficiaries of the \$5,000,400,000 of actual or reflected payments to farmers under the price-support programs on basic commodities have been the upper one-third of our farmers—some 9 million who live on 2 million of the most efficient and well-operated farms.

On February 17, 1955, Secretary Benson in his testimony on H. R. 12 before the House Agriculture Committee gave a detailed statement to the effect that the costs of these programs had been \$5,000,400,000.

So that there will be no confusion on this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent part of his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES—
HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON H. R. 12

STATEMENT OF EZRA TAFT BENSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Explanatory comments on statement of realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income, fiscal years 1932-54

The above statement is designed to show, on a factual and objective basis, the realized costs of the programs of the Department of Agriculture which by various means have operated to strengthen and protect the price of farm commodities and the income of farmers. Such programs have been operated in accordance with, and in the manner prescribed by, authorizing legislation. The terminology used to designate the programs is governed by legislative and expenditure authorizations. The amounts are consistent with the accounting records of this Department and of the United States Treasury. * * *

Of the \$8,469.2 million realized costs of these programs, \$5,077.1 million is attributable to the basic commodities, as follows:

	Millions
Corn	\$1,228.2
Cotton	1,581.4
Peanuts	163.0
Rice	35.3
Tobacco	97.0
Wheat	1,972.2
Total	5,077.1

These realized costs for basic commodities are attributable to the following programs:

	Millions
CCC nonrecourse loan, purchase and payment programs	\$198.1
CCC supply, commodity export, and other activities	59.6
International Wheat Agreement	602.4
Emergency assistance to Pakistan and other friendly peoples	73.1
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	556.3
Federal crop insurance	71.6
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program	1,666.3
Agricultural adjustment programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas)	76.7
Parity payments	937.1
Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	1.3
Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	505.6
Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred	286.4
Distribution costs on CCC stocks for emergency feed program	12.6
Total	5,077.1

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Dr. Nicholls also told the joint committee:

Nine percent of the farms produced 51 percent also of the total value of farm products sold, and 22 percent produced 74 percent of the total value of farm products sold.

Obviously, price-support programs, as we now know them, primarily benefit those

larger farmers, and I would probably agree with you that they are the ones who need financial aid from the Government least, because they are large and efficient and have rather high incomes.

On the other hand, I think that at the lower end of the scale, the end of the scale that you are speaking of, price support will simply not do much good. Let me give an example. You know, we have minimum tobacco allotments in burley of, I believe, about seven-tenths of an acre now, and this is the minimum, as far as the small farmer is concerned. He cannot be cut below that, as I understand it, but what does this mean in terms of income? Seven-tenths of an acre would produce, let us say, a thousand pounds of tobacco; that is \$500 gross income per year, and that is certainly not going to make any small farmer very well off, it seems to me—especially after he has paid for his seed, fertilizer, and other expenses.

In other words, I think the solution to the low-income farmer's problem really lies largely outside of agriculture (hearings, pp. 629-630).

For every dollar that the small farmer receives through price support many more dollars go to the big operator, and the competitive advantage of the big operator is thereby increased.

For example, in Kansas, for the 1953 crop, the average wheat loan was \$1,525, and the average of the 5 largest loans was \$106,963. In Mississippi the average cotton loan was \$372, and the average of the 5 largest loans was \$479,535. In Iowa, the average corn loan was \$2,154, while the average of the 5 largest loans was \$93,535.

For wheat, corn, and cotton in the above States, the 5 largest loans averaged

25, 46, and 1,290 times as great, respectively, as the State averages.

Mr. President, in this respect, I want to call attention to the fact that last year 1.9 percent of the American farmers got 25 percent of the money farmers received under the price-support program. With respect to the 1953 crop of wheat, corn, and cotton, USDA figures reveal that 64 farmers received nonrecourse loans which were over \$100,000, while 2 of them were over \$1 million apiece.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Producers with largest quantity of corn, wheat, and cotton under loan, 1953 crop

Name and address of producer	Quantity under loan	Amount of loan	Name and address of producer	Quantity under loan	Amount of loan
ALABAMA			MONTANA		
Cotton:			Wheat:		
J. B. Hain & Co., Sardis.....bales..	989	\$178, 171.35	United States Wheat Corp., Hardin.....bushels..	184, 516	\$348, 646
J. A. Minter & Sons, Tyler.....do.....	816	146, 525.75	H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester.....do.....	116, 118	232, 527
ARIZONA			J. R. Katzenberger, Highwood.....do.....	50, 875	101, 982
Cotton:			Roy Killenbeck, Scooby.....do.....	48, 639	101, 675
Bogle Farms, Chandler.....do.....	1, 870	503, 908.11	NEW MEXICO		
B. F. Yongeker, Buckeye.....do.....	1, 911	298, 129.46	Cotton:		
J. G. Boswell, Litchfield Park.....do.....	406	198, 972.82	Hayner Ranch, Las Cruces.....bales..	1, 080	177, 836
ARKANSAS			Thigpen & Funk, Lake Arthur.....do.....	890	149, 009
Wheat: Wesson Farms, Inc., Victoria.....bushels..	88, 756	209, 034.31	J. P. White, Jr., Roswell.....do.....	764	139, 704
Cotton:			Hal Bogle, Dexter.....do.....	801	131, 510
B. C. Land Co., Leachville.....bales..	2, 291	412, 361.10	Bowman & Son, Artesia.....do.....	761	126, 112
St. Francis Valley Farms, Marked Tree.....do.....	1, 067	192, 072.15	NORTH DAKOTA		
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson.....do.....	875	152, 462.98	Wheat: Wittman Co., Mohal.....bushels..	58, 850	127, 281
Roy Chaney, Coy.....do.....	581	103, 499.10	CALIFORNIA		
L. W. Rodgers, West Memphis.....do.....	577	102, 191.50	Wheat: Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles.....do.....	68, 471	147, 007
COLORADO			Cotton:		
Wheat:			Giffen, Inc., Huron.....bales..	7, 314	1, 246, 516
J. H. & N. M. Monaghan Farms Co., Derby.....bushels..	157, 443	338, 535.55	Charles Schwartz, Stratford.....do.....	3, 947	604, 321
Box Elder Farms Co., Denver.....do.....	71, 939	171, 801.82	Wheller Farms, Bakersfield.....do.....	3, 373	499, 008
IDAHO			Roberts Farms, McFarland.....do.....	2, 910	456, 133
Wheat:			A. Shrier & Sons, Delano.....do.....	2, 785	440, 695
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culesac.....do.....	85, 842	172, 677.00	OREGON		
A. E. Bott, Newdale.....do.....	66, 294	109, 158.00	Wheat:		
Ira McIntosh and Sons, Lewiston.....do.....	55, 978	112, 401.00	Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton.....bushels..	124, 002	270, 607
ILLINOIS			Hill Ranches, Pendleton.....do.....	85, 858	178, 070
Corn: Lester Pfister, El Paso.....do.....	71, 712	116, 173.44	Marlon T. Weatherford, Arlington.....do.....	84, 304	197, 939
INDIANA			E. R. McCansie, La Grande.....do.....	57, 184	116, 631
Corn: Emil Savich, Rensselaer.....do.....	102, 648	166, 289.76	H. A. Miller, Bond.....do.....	51, 756	119, 445
IOWA			SOUTH CAROLINA		
Corn: Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt.....do.....	124, 800	190, 944.00	Cotton: McColl Realty Co., Bennettsville.....bales..	1, 293	208, 475
KANSAS			SOUTH DAKOTA		
Wheat:			Wheat: J. E. Cheek, Pierre.....bushels..	46, 150	101, 530
Carl Smith, Goodland.....do.....	64, 277	139, 237.00	TENNESSEE		
Fred Shields, Goodland.....do.....	57, 669	125, 198.00	Cotton: H. S. Mitchell, Millington.....bales..	597	109, 277
Garvey Farms, Colby.....do.....	43, 132	104, 263.00	TEXAS		
LOUISIANA			Wheat: W. T. Waggoner Trust Estate, Box 2130, Vernon.....bushels..	73, 087	175, 660
Cotton: Ray P. Oden, Shreveport.....bales..	876	153, 339.43	Cotton:		
MISSISSIPPI			Ralph Farms, San Elizario.....bales..	1, 096	323, 686
Cotton:			J. E. Porter, Caldwell.....do.....	1, 293	208, 139
Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott.....do.....	7, 220	1, 269, 492.66	Carl Clawson, Lubbock.....do.....	1, 209	201, 492
O. F. Bledsoe Plantation, Greenwood.....do.....	2, 328	394, 351.03	Dooley & Hendricks, Roscoe.....do.....	1, 210	201, 007
B. F. Harbert & Co., Robinsonville.....do.....	1, 889	359, 204.39	Claude Collins, Jr., and S. Y. Wilson, 3135 Wheeling Street, El Paso.....bales..	694	162, 875
Sturdivant, Yandell & Wilburn, Vance.....do.....	1, 061	191, 256.48	WASHINGTON		
Circle X Plantation, Indianola.....do.....	1, 127	183, 371.69	Wheat:		
MISSOURI			Horrigan Farms, Prosser.....bushels..	152, 840	354, 339
Cotton: E. P. Coleman, Sikeston.....do.....	3, 655	643, 993.37	Horrigan Investment Co., 1411 4th Ave. Bldg., Seattle.....bushels..	92, 382	201, 832
			E. C. Hay, Tekoa.....do.....	87, 376	178, 196
			The Sheffels Co., Govan.....do.....	86, 294	182, 756
			Don Damon, Cunningham.....do.....	85, 262	182, 717

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it should immediately become obvious that the problems associated with lifting the levels of living of about two-thirds of our farm people who live on farms which, for one reason or another are uneconomical units, and the problems have not been and can never be solved through price-support programs.

It helps a farmer very little to have prices go up if he has little or nothing to sell, which is just about the size of it for two-thirds of our farmers.

From the foregoing, therefore, it is evident that the average "family-sized farm"—which we hear so much about the need for preserving these days—is really not much of a farm at all.

Under these circumstances, as I stated in my remarks last August during the debate on the price support program, it is not too difficult to understand why agricultural spokesmen have exhibited little awareness of basic agricultural problems outside the two orbits of price and credit. From a practical point of view, it is only being realistic to recog-

nize that we can help only a small number of farmers to find their niche in agriculture. As our economy grows, agriculture's part will become relatively smaller; that is, a smaller percentage of the total population will be needed to produce our food. Our conclusion, based upon cold economic fact, is not that we should have less agricultural policy, but rather that in speeding the improvement of productivity, marketing and consumption through basic research, we must also make adequate provision for expediting the migration out of agriculture which that improvement necessitates.

One of the proposals of the Republican farm program last year was to study this situation and make recommendations for actions to be taken to assist our low-income families. During 1954, the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission gave paramount attention to this problem, as did an interagency task force of the Council of Economic Advisors. The special report has now been made public, and it contains, in my opinion, much valuable information with which every Member of Congress could well afford to acquaint himself.

These two problems and their interrelationship are ably discussed in an article by Mr. Holmes Alexander entitled, "Agriculture's Upper Crust Gets Most Farm Benefits," which appeared in the May 5 issue of the Salt Lake Tribune. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE'S UPPER CRUST GETS MOST FARM BENEFITS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, who got rigid price-support laws off the books, is trying for another miracle—to get the low-income farmer off the land.

The Secretary, a genuine humanitarian, doesn't go in for planning people's lives. His new program, he says, "has no goals other than those voluntarily chosen. * * * People will make wise decisions if informed."

All the same, Mr. Benson knows what's wrong with the American farm economy. It's this:

The rich get rich, and the poor don't get their share of income or subsidies.

Can he do anything about it? Well, he's giving it a mighty try.

First, he must hold the gains of the last congressional session in substituting flexible supports for rigid ones on the six basic farm crops. There is a well-backed bill (H. R. 12) in the House of Representatives to restore fixed subsidies. If it passes the House, Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, says he'll bury it in the Senate Agriculture Committee. If it should be wrenched from ELLENDER's drawer and shoved through the Senate, Mr. Eisenhower will veto it. But it's mortally certain to be a mammoth issue in the Presidential election next year.

Price support is closely related to poverty and overpopulation on the farm. We are now spending about \$8 billion a year on farm benefits, about 80 percent of which goes to the upper-income crust—those who do commercial farming on the so-called basics. Very little money trickles down to the dirt farmers who try to live off the soil and characteristically raise big families. In these days of lush prosperity it's almost incredible to find that 1½ million farm families make less

than \$1,000 a year. Since they send very little to market from their meager acreage, they get almost no benefit from the high prices.

Although Mr. Benson hasn't said so in plain words, it's an educated guess that he looks upon a fixed price system as a system for keeping poor farmers poor and rich farmers rich.

When the Secretary took over in the Agriculture Department in 1953, he brought from his home State of Utah a young economist, Reed L. Frischknecht, Ph. D., author of a University of Utah thesis on price supports. The heart of the thesis is the well-buttressed conclusion that, based on 1933-50 figures, price supports never have and never can solve the problem of agricultural income. The majority of farmers are merely sentenced to penury in order that the minority get parity.

Price support can be justly charged with another sin—that of weighting down the low-income farmer with unfair conditions of labor. He may be a man without the ability or inclination to commercialize his wares. Or he may not raise the six subsidized crops. But what of that? These crops account for only 23 percent of the national farm income. There is nothing sacred about wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and cotton—except that their raisers keep a trained herd of subservient Congressmen.

Mr. Benson hopes that if the flexible support program lasts another 2 years it will have the effect of redistributing the land.

Some of the "sultcase farmers," as he calls them, will pack off to the city when sure and easy profits are gone from raising crops for Government storage. It's logical to expect that some of the vacated real estate will reach people who still like to raise their families on the land.

The Secretary wants to see more Federal money go into research, into retraining of part-time farmers for off-the-farm jobs, into inducements for attracting industries to build out-in-the-country factories. The Secretary wants a reactivation of county planning groups which were set up in 1933-34 before agriculture came to Washington. He thinks that many surpluses can be sold right in the region where they're raised. He believes that the way to abolish poverty is to increase opportunity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Richard Lee Jones, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1960.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

John W. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Francis L. Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Guy K. Bard, resigned.

Herbert P. Sorg, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice Timothy T. Cronin, term expired.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be captains

Crudo, Frank S., Jr., MC, O4014207.
Grega, Steven J., MC, O1746834.
Hogan, Thomas F., Jr., MC, O2203511.
Koptik, George F., Jr., MC, O1934608.
MacAulay, Malcolm G., MC, O1938468.

To be first lieutenants

Bergan, Robert D., DC.
Busse, Norma V., WAC, L1020603.
Clarke, Mary E., WAC, L1010079.
Dobson, Charles W., DC, O2267564.
Gault, James L., JAGC, O2270289.
Holmes, Beatrice V., ANC, N900453.
Jaggers, Joe H., DC, O548301.
McKim, Betty J., ANC, N900346.
Meengs, Philip G., JAGC, O2268633.
Paul, Geraldine, WAC, L1010205.
Peterson, Dorothy J., WMSC, M2309.
Reeves, Joseph, MSC, O997238.

To be second lieutenants

Accountus, Patricia L., WMSC, R2644.
Dotts, Eloise M., WAC, L1010758.
Fisher, Audrey A., WAC, L1020628.
Mykleby, Phyllis R., WAC, L1010638.
Schmerling, Doris M., WAC, L1020646.
Smith, Ann B., WAC, L1010669.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Baker, George I., O2200783.
DuBois, James J., O4030405.
Castellot, John J., O2273734.
Einarson, John, O4033369.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grade specified:

To be first lieutenants

Sudderth, David H., Jr., O70519.
Welch, Paul B., Jr., O70062.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Hogsten, Edward M., O1876715.

To be second lieutenants

Burke, John M. M., O4009322.
 Goss, Ephraim M., O4006837.
 Himmel, Daniel L., O4010011.
 Johnson, Richard T., O4006534.
 Mann, William M., Jr., O4006577.
 Masters, Barrie P., O4006095.
 Nodland, Stanley K., O4010076.
 Philbrick, Donald F., O4011156.
 Rathburn, Vinton L., O4021115.
 Thompson, Lonnie E., O4010275.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Babiak, Paul L. Pearson, Roger C.,
 Burba, Joseph W., Jr. O4042863
 Dubovick, Richard R. Pryor, James M., Jr.,
 Gooch, Charles L. O4025673
 Kafonek, Richard H., Stansell, William J.
 O4040283 Tandy, Donald F.,
 Miller, Raymond H., O4025723
 O4041218

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Dettor, Charles M. Keolanui, Lawrence
 Dowery, Gordon K. K., Jr.
 Sisk, Leonard C.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Adams, Tom, Jr. Helm, Gunther A.,
 Albers, James J. O4018431
 Arnzen, Chester L., Hensley, William R.
 O4026952 Hesse, Richard P.
 Bady, Raymond L. Hayde, Jay A.
 Beatty, Donald B. Hill, Vernon B., Jr.
 Beeler, Samuel L. Hollowell, Emmett P.,
 Bell, Charles H. Jr.
 Blakeburn, Dave L. Howell, Thomas R.
 Britten, Samuel L. Hudman, George D.
 Brooks, George W. Hutchinson, Hugh F.,
 Burgess, Garnet O. Jr.
 Burkett, Seth W. Jones, J. L.
 Caplice John M. Karr, Don E.
 Carlisle, Alan R. Knight, John K.
 Carnes, Julian H., Jr. Kreidel, Morris K.
 Caster, Robert W. Labinski, Raymond J.,
 Casto, Philip C. Jr.
 Chisolm, Patrick D., Leatherwood, Frank
 Jr. B., Jr.
 Clark, Richard D. LeVieux, Larry J.
 Clayberg, Richard P. Levine, Seymour
 Crawford, Theodore A. Link, Thomas H.
 DeFatta, Vincent P. Littlejohn, Roy
 Detyens, Joseph W. Longacre, David H.
 Dorough, Philip E. Love, James R.
 Duggan, Daniel E. MacPhail, William,
 Farris, Robert I. Jr.
 Fauss, George H., Jr. Martin, Thurman O.
 Frazier, Kenneth M. Masters, Robert D.
 Freeman, Donald J. Millard, Stephens F.
 Garrison, Melvyn V. Miller, Jake
 Gibson, Mack L., Jr. Moore, Herbert W.
 Gomes, Lloyd E. Morris, Glenn S.
 Gooding, Eugene O. Nave, Billy J.
 Gould, Frank O. Newman, Jesse K.
 Grabiak, Richard W. Owen, David T.
 Griyna, Lawrence F. Parrish, Glenwood N.
 Gunning, Edward G. Peyton, Edwin B.
 Halsey, Milton B., Jr. Poarch, Henry H., Jr.
 Hammond, Walter L., Jr. Rampfeler, John K.
 Haltiwanger, Marion E. Ramsey, John D.
 Harrington, William V., Jr. Robbins, Edwin E., Jr.
 Hayes, John T. Robinson, Benjamin
 F., Jr.
 Hazelip, Albert C., Jr. Roby, Robert L.

Schmale, William O. Van Horn, Jonathan S.
 Seelinger, John A. Walker, John G., Jr.
 Shockley, Henry A. Walker, Robert L.,
 Sieminski, Edmund J. O4033422
 Sinclair, Waldo G., Jr. Ware, Gilbert
 Smiley, Ronald H. Webber, Paul R., III
 Snow, James A. Wemmering, Fred A.,
 Stephens, James G. Jr.
 Tanner, Walter D. Woodward, J. Troy
 Thorpe, Marvin, Jr. Zittrain, Lawrence O.
 Turner, Gary L. Zwahlen, Robert J.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

Major to lieutenant colonel

CHAPLAIN

Griffin, James Clarke, 18740A.
 Hughes, John Michael, 18742A.
 Warner, Verne Henry, 18743A.

Captain to major

CHAPLAIN

X Hammon, Wilson C., 18805A.

First lieutenant to captain

AIR FORCE

Barentine, Herbert B., 17870A.
 Knotts, Ulysses Simeon, Jr., 17874A.
 X Bloodgood, Donald Dille, 17863A.
 Stokes, Francis Rudolph, 17867A.
 Tucker, James Scott, 17861A.
 Petree, Lennox Irwin, 17865A.
 X Frear, Carl Robert, Jr., 17869A.
 X Bost, John Herbert, 17875A.
 X Poland, LaVerne William, 17868A.
 X Wytock, Harry Louis, 17872A.
 X Thompson, John Carl, 17871A.
 Tetric, Jacques Kelley, 17977A.
 Pasenhofer, Arlo Harding, 20696A.
 X King, Welton Roger, 21465A.
 X Casey, James Francis, 23729A.
 X Nichols, Joseph Carl, Jr., 20699A.
 McBride, Clyde DeWitt, 20698A.
 X St. Clair, Eugene Christian, 20697A.
 X Ford, James Juner, 24350A.
 X Briand, Paul Louis, Jr., 17882A.
 Hofacker, William Allen, 17880A.
 Foster, Richard, 17878A.
 X Davis, Victor Monroe, Jr., 17884A.
 Burkholder, Richard W., 17883A.
 Sturgill, Stanley Lewis, 17879A.
 Zollinger, Joe Edward, 17877A.
 Schmal, Gordon William, 20700A.
 X Schauwecker, Paul Gard, 21466A.
 Disharoon, John Franklin, Jr., 22727A.
 Teague, Charles Edward, 22728A.
 Paup, John Wilbur, 24352A.
 Jagitsch, Robert Frederick, 24351A.
 X Higgins, William McNamara, 22729A.
 Voynich, John Joseph, 24713A.
 Catts, William George, 23189A.
 Ware, Ivan, 22730A.
 Renick, Ned Weldin, 20701A.
 X Sorge, Marlowe Benson, 17885A.
 X Ballard, Carl Welch, 17886A.
 Trowbridge, Lee Myron, 20702A.
 Lane, Edward Eugene, 22731A.
 Miller, Ollie Dee, 24715A.
 Russell, Marvin Wesley, Jr., 22732A.
 X Marvin, Marion Arnold, Jr., 20704A.
 X McCarthy, Giles Justin, 25620A.
 X Brinson, Pat Davis, 17887A.
 Hoxie, Lloyd Eugene, 20705A.
 X Fowler, Norman John, Jr., 23730A.
 X Monier, Robert Burton, 17889A.
 X Longwell, Frank Carl, 17890A.
 Bressler, Ray Bloom, Jr., 17891A.
 Hobart, Charles Franklin, 20706A.
 Johnson, James Calvin, 24716A.
 Tighe, Leo Joseph, 20707A.
 Crane, George Arthur, Jr., 17893A.
 X Donlon, William Edward, Jr., 17895A.
 Harlow, Raymon Willis, 17892A.
 X Schlapper, Robert Alfred, 17894A.
 Dobbs, Charles Edward, 20708A.
 X Leon, James Sylvester, 23731A.
 X Thorpe, William Joseph, 17896A.
 X Swofford, Ralph Jackson, 22733A.
 Ryan, Thomas Peter, Jr., 24717A.
 Turbyfill, Carl Mitchell, Jr., 25518A.
 Doyle, Lawrence Altair, 17897A.
 Eckerlin, Robert Carl, 17917A.
 X McCallum, Ernest Leland, 17898A.
 X Martin, James Clarence, Jr., 17909A.
 Allen, Ralph Gordon, Jr., 17911A.
 McPherson, Daniel Edward, Jr., 17907A.
 X Latham, Donald Rising, 17904A.
 X Buckley, Ernest Lynn, 17912A.
 Humphreys, Charles Baldwin, 17913A.
 X Brown, George Gardner, Jr., 17914A.
 Carlson, Donald Delton, 17916A.
 Lyon, Herbert Arthur, 17905A.
 X Barnard, John Ross, 17920A.
 Delaune, Herman Louis, 17915A.
 Kvamme, Orville James, 17918A.
 Cusworth, Charles, 17901A.
 X Dick, James Liggett, 17906A.
 X McElmurry, Thomas Uriel, 17908A.
 X Hickey, John King, 17902A.
 Miller, William Field, 17910A.
 Schiele, Joe Scott, 17921A.
 X O'Clock, Robert, 17899A.
 Stockhouse, Robert Erland, 17922A.
 X Steele, Donald Franklin, 17966A.
 X Sizemore, Robert Emmett, 17970A.
 Shipp, John Bonney, Jr., 17975A.
 X Barnes, George Wise, Jr., 21467A.
 Jones, Ralph Frederick, 22734A.
 X Wood, R. L., 23732A.
 X Young, Rush Lawrence, 25621A.
 Daniel, John Ira, 3d, 17923A.
 X McGee, Robert Eugene, 17924A.
 Tooley, Bobby Jose, 17925A.
 X Malone, William Riley, Jr., 18307A.
 X MacPherson, Stephen Joseph, 20710A.
 Hess, Alfred Sidney, 24353A.
 Thompson, William David, 20711A.
 X Detrick, William Robert, 23733A.
 Boyette, Albert Wellons, 20712A.
 Yawn, Henry Clay, 3d, 22735A.
 Balch, Clayton Leeman, Jr., 23734A.
 Castle, Arnold Conrad, 26681A.
 Baird, Jacob Cletus, 22736A.
 Burleigh, Albert Henry, 20714A.
 Morris, Jean Elyse, 26682W.
 X Korpanty, Leo Stanley, 24354A.
 X Rindy, Dean Robert, 17927A.
 Hooker, Malcolm Patterson, 20715A.
 X Maxwell, John Wade, 24355A.
 X Blanding, Charles Briggs, 21468A.
 X Counts, Dave, 24718A.
 Kelly, Eugene Edward, 25622A.
 X Moseley, Elwyn Albert, 20716A.
 X Parker, Michael Neal, 17929A.
 X Adams, Robert Leslie, 17928A.
 X Dyer, Kenneth Layton, Jr., 20717A.
 Blandin, Robert Wallace, 23735A.
 Calmes, William Pratt, 25519A.
 Sherman, Clayton Clifford, 22738A.
 X Rizer, Virgil Hugh, 23736A.
 X Crumpton, Lloyd Alfred, 20718A.
 X Northcott, Clyde Andrew, Jr., 22739A.
 Czekaj, Walter Adam, 24356A.
 X Ihrig, Maxwell Junior, 20719A.
 Oliphant, John Houston, 25620A.
 Steinhardt, Charles Sidney, 25623A.
 X Norris, Basil Stanley, 25624A.
 X Burdette, James Miles, Jr., 17930A.
 Kilpatrick, Albert Raymond, 20720A.
 Myers, Naaman Lee, 22740A.
 Baumann, Kenneth Whitmore, 23737A.
 X Gornall, John Lowell, 20721A.
 Evelyn, Clyde Preston, 23738A.
 X Mueller, Norman Fred, 18308A.
 X Mashburn, Mayo Lewis, 25625A.
 X McCracken, David Lawrence, Jr., 23740A.
 Doughty, David Hamilton, 20722A.
 Morris, Julian Bernard, 23741A.
 Mann, Lyle Eugene, 24357A.
 Hardy, Carl Eldred, Jr., 23742A.
 Cattrell, Harry Roscoe, 24358A.
 Dunlap, John Verdier, 20723A.

× Allen, Ledewey Ellis, Jr., 22742A.
 Prieve, Donald George, 23743A.
 Townsend, Jesse Frederick, Jr., 20724A.

MEDICAL

× Di Giovanni, Anthony John, 25477A.
 × Dettinger, Garth Bryant, 25478A.
 × Balyeat, Ray Milton, 25476A.
 × Partyka, Leo Charles, 25479A.
 × Bednarz, Wallace Walter, 25697A.
 Wolter, David Frank, 26363A.
 Thompson, James Mitchell, 26364A.
 × Minyard, A. E., 25659A.
 × Kolb, Earl John, Jr., 25480A.
 × Chambers, William Norman, 24223A.
 × Haynes, Herbert Curtin, 25643A.
 × Jackson, Carmalt Benjamin, Jr., 25660A.
 × Goslin, Frederick Billings, 25661A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Weiss, Earl, 23222A.
 × Hodgkins, Harold Charles, 24234A.
 × Black, Wilbert Anderson, 21629A.
 × Park, Arthur Walker, 23077A.

CHAPLAIN

× Bayha, Charles David, 24690A.
 Shaddox, Thomas Nelson, Jr., 25632A.
Second Lieutenant to First Lieutenant

AIR FORCE

× Julian, Thomas Anthony, 23389A.
 Shields, William Laurie, Jr., 23518A.
 Brickel, James Russell, 23277A.
 × Welsh, Leland Merritt, 23565A.
 Webb, Carl Robert, 23562A.
 May, David Chapin, Jr., 23442A.
 × Kirk, William Leroy, 23401A.
 × Streett, James Kenneth, 23539A.
 × Studebaker, William Anthony, 23541A.
 × Smith, Roy Benjamin, 23528A.
 × McEvers, Robert Darwin, 23449A.
 Gay, Robert Anson, 23341A.
 × McCullough, Willard Lee, 23448A.
 Todd, George William, 3d, 23550A.
 Peters, Arthur Carl, Jr., 23481A.
 Stafford, Thomas Patten, 23544A.
 × McEwen, Thomas Carothers, Jr., 23450A.
 Bryan, Charles Waters, 23282A.
 × Mattox, Reginald Hardy, 23438A.
 × Bridgman, Charles James, 23278A.
 Winne, Clinton Harold, Jr., 23572A.
 Hobbs, Thomas Herbert, 23370A.
 × Sullivan, James Harold, 23542A.
 × Paulk, John Irvine, 23479A.
 Girard, Raymond Francis, Jr., 23345A.
 × Denfield, Richard Eduard, 23315A.
 × Rutte, Robert Louis, 23505A.
 × Dickinson, John Charles, Jr., 23317A.
 × Skantze, Lawrence Albert, 23523A.
 Givens, Edward Galen, Jr., 23346A.
 Olson, John Theodore, 23472A.
 Dimon, George Huntington, Jr., 23318A.
 × Markum, Joseph Aloysius, Jr., 23433A.
 × Ivers, James Harges, 23380A.
 Mauldin, Mack, Jr., 23440A.
 × Eisele, Donn Fulton, 23323A.
 × Bulger, Joseph Arthur, Jr., 23283A.
 × Pahre, Elmer Gordon, 23475A.
 × Steele, William Oliver, 23535A.
 × Johnson, Roger Wayne, 23386A.
 Johnson, Lawrence Duane, 23384A.
 × Thawley, Thomas Melvin, 23548A.
 Smith, James Henry, 23526A.
 Dana, William Harvey, 23309A.
 Erdle, Philip John, 23327A.
 × Kelsey, Thomas Leese, 23395A.
 × Strickland, Robert Neal, 23540A.
 Hester, Keete Lockett, 23365A.
 Sell, John Richard, 23514A.
 × Dunn, William Walton, 23321A.
 Kelly, William Bernard, 23394A.
 Winger, Robert Fredrick Curry, 23571A.
 × Hilland, Carl Boyd, 23367A.
 × Knaggs, John Christopher, 23402A.
 Kelley, Robert Neill, 23393A.
 × Dodson, Clinton Festus, Jr., 23319A.
 × Leonard, Edward Jones, 23414A.
 Brown, Bruce Kilroy, 23281A.
 Schwartz, John William, 23512A.
 × Mitchell, Harry Martin, 23457A.
 Clark, Allen, Jr., 23296A.
 × Kubal, George Jerome, 23406A.

× Ralph, John Edward, 23488A.
 × Craig, Robert Jay, 23303A.
 × Pldkovicz, Joseph, 23482A.
 × Jensen, Donald Eugene, 23382A.
 Kendall, Robert Bruce, 23396A.
 McInerney, James Eugene, Jr., 23452A.
 × Pimentel, Frank T., 23483A.
 × Rounding, Robert Campbell, 23503A.
 × Stockdale, Wendell Berg, 23537A.
 × White, Edward Higgins, 2d, 23567A.
 × Mulcahy, Richard Thomas, 23463A.
 Simonet, Kenneth Adrian, 23521A.
 × Maughan, William Patrick, 23439A.
 × Washington, Robert Walter, 23561A.
 × George, George Abraham, 23342A.
 McLemore, John Robinson, 23454A.
 × Anderson, Mason Evans, 23260A.
 × Moore, Thomas Willard, Jr., 23459A.
 × Portney, Joseph Nathaniel, 23484A.
 × Underwood, James Edward, 23554A.
 × Schifferli, Walter Frederic, Jr., 23510A.
 Lyons, Richard Curtis, 23426A.
 × Loeschner, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., 23421A.
 Hunt, Harvison, 23377A.
 Crowell, James Britton, Jr., 23307A.
 × Prueher, Roi Francis, Jr., 23486A.
 Naber, Gerald Junior, 23466A.
 × Troutman, James Scott, 23553A.
 × Masi, Joseph Louis, 23435A.
 × Kronlund, Kenneth Harold, 23405A.
 × Urschel, Joseph John, 23555A.
 × Hall, Richard John, 23366A.
 Kingsley, Glennon Mead, 2d, 23400A.
 Collins, Michael, 23298A.
 × Deaton, William Alexander, 23312A.
 Rottler, William Drayton, 23502A.
 × Austin, Joseph Clair, 23262A.
 × Richter, Edward Bailey, 23496A.
 × Thompson, Paul Bristol, Jr., 23549A.
 Scaman, Warren Alan, 23509A.
 × Isidoro, Robert Joseph, 23379A.
 × Allen, John Henry, 23259A.
 × Reeves, James Horace, 23490A.
 × Owens, Robert Andrew, 23474A.
 × Rohr, Davis Charles, 23500A.
 × Walsh, Charles James, 23560A.
 Hutton, John Edward, Jr., 23378A.
 × Rentschler, Russel Riegel, 23492A.
 × Kersteen, Richard Elmer, 23397A.
 × Snodgrass, Clyde William, 23531A.
 Tacke, Raymond Leroy, 23545A.
 × Koestner, Raymond Fred, 23404A.
 Woodward, Robert Donald, 23574A.
 × Tallman, Oliver Howard, 2d, 23546A.
 × Williams, Jack, Jr., 23569A.
 Richardson, Donald Luther, 23493A.
 Dickey, Roy Sterling, 23316A.
 × Maddocks, Preston Tyson, 23430A.
 Lester, George William, Jr., 23417A.
 × Luther, Charles Jennings, 23425A.
 × Britton, William Guy, 23279A.
 Conover, John Cedric, 23299A.
 × Johnson, Clarence Louis, 23383A.
 × Morgan, John Ross, Jr., 23461A.
 × Shelgren, Robert Nels, 23517A.
 × Cook, Jack Wilbur, 23300A.
 Rollston, John Paul, 23501A.
 Robinson, John Francis, 23498A.
 × Saxer, Richard Karl, 23507A.
 Monopoli, Richard Vito, 23458A.
 × Cosner, Wendell Ernest, 23302A.
 × Milner, John Edward, 23456A.
 Sanchez, Manuel Patricio, 23506A.
 McCoy, Richard Ernest, 23447A.
 × Mayer, John Henry, 23443A.
 × Howell, Robert Lynn, 23374A.
 Van Bergen, Richard Henry, 23556A.
 × Noel, Paul Edward, 23468A.
 × Baldwin, John Landaker, 23265A.
 × Munson, Clarence Nash, 23464A.
 × Moravec, Robert, 23460A.
 × Hauff, Frank William, Jr., 23361A.
 × Scott, Richard Hilling, 23513A.
 Delaney, William John, 23314A.
 Hubeli, Robert Eugene, 23376A.
 Payne, Dwight Ernest, 23480A.
 Youree, Charles David, Jr., 23576A.
 × Miller, Francis Harold, 23455A.
 × Young, David Dale, 23575A.
 × King, Edwin Harris, Jr., 23398A.
 × Gorman, Robert Hinds, 23348A.
 Schultz, Ernest Gordon, 23511A.

× Sjaastad, Gerald Don, 23522A.
 Larimer, Walker Ames, 23411A.
 × Lusby, William Arthur, Jr., 23424A.
 × Lay, James Odo, 23412A.
 × McClung, Thomas James, 23445A.
 Hogan, James Dickerson, 23371A.
 × Churchill, Louis Lawrence, 23295A.
 Burch, Robert Morris, 23285A.
 × Hoyt, William Brenner, 23375A.
 Linkenhoger, William Lee, 23419A.
 × Ortiz, Marvin, 23473A.
 Niblack, Emmett Augustus, Jr., 23467A.
 × Hester, Harold Hayne, 23364A.
 King, Robert Bennett, 23399A.
 × Houston, Jesse Barnes, Jr., 23373A.
 × Gordon, William DeWitt, 23347A.
 × Hazlett, Wendell Thomas, 23362A.
 Craine, Robert Louis, 23304A.
 Smith, William Andrew, 23529A.
 × Maxson, William Burdette, 23441A.
 Berry, Roy Nelson, 2d, 23273A.
 Crews, James Ronald, 23306A.
 Rodeen, James, 23499A.
 Read, Charles Harold Wickliffe, Jr., 23489A.
 × Gragg, Walter Lee, Jr., 23350A.
 × Kutz, Gerald Alvin, 23407A.
 Kelt, Francis Xavier, 23392A.
 × Beauregard, Theodore Henry, 23270A.
 × Burch, James William, 23284A.
 × Quinn, James Lee, Jr., 23487A.
 Landon, William Dearborn, 23409A.
 West, Henry Meadows, 23566A.
 × Cordes, Keith Donald, 23301A.
 × Marchand, Jean Maurice, 23432A.
 Carter, Henry F., 23290A.
 × Rider, Graham Wharton, 23497A.
 × Bingham, William Paul, 23274A.
 Jenkins, Elmer Mason, 23381A.
 × Webster, Arthur Lake, 2d, 23563A.
 Wiggins, James Richard, 23568A.
 Swatt, Stephen William, 23544A.
 Macomber, Victor Kingsland, 23428A.
 × Etheridge, Coy Eugene, Jr., 23330A.
 × Morrin, Richard Bruce, 23462A.
 × Leonard, Ralph Edmund, 23415A.
 Carlone, Robert Angelo, 23289A.
 Johnson, Paul Wayne, 23385A.
 × Woodward, James William, Jr., 23573A.
 × Hattin, Ronald Farrell, 23360A.
 × Erwine, James Richard, 23328A.
 × Stephens, John Peter, 23536A.
 × Freeman, Robert Franklin, 23337A.
 Bakke, Thomas Neil, 23264A.
 Carey, Gerald John, Jr., 23288A.
 × Bower, Joseph Edward, 23276A.
 Spence, James Everett, Jr., 23533A.
 × Campbell, William Harold, 23287A.
 × Troske, Erwin Edwin, Jr., 23552A.
 Beard, Bruce Raymond, 23269A.
 Hamilton, Ercell Century, Jr., 23358A.
 × Daniels, Edward Eugene, 23310A.
 Rule, George Lloyd, Jr., 23504A.
 McPeeters, James Richard, 23451A.
 × Lucas, Larry Roland, 23422A.
 × Clarke, Lawrence Hutchinson, Jr., 23297A.
 × Gallinger, William Davis, 23340A.
 × Fuelling, Paul William, Jr., 23339A.
 × Aldredge, James Henry, Jr., 23258A.
 Evans, William Ashby, Jr., 23331A.
 × Lang, David Wall, 23410A.
 × Pajares, Robert Don, 23476A.
 × Fellerman, Keith David, 23333A.
 × Reichmuth, Charles Ferdinand, 23491A.
 × Degnan, John Samuel, 23313A.
 × Friedman, Karl Morris, 23338A.
 Burciaga, Juan Guerrero, 23286A.
 × Mathers, Robert Gilbert, 23437A.
 × Kanakanui, Richard Dwight, 23390A.
 Anderson, Warren Randolph, 23261A.
 × Griffing, Donald Alford, 23353A.
 Barton, Donald William, 23268A.
 Bartley, Robert Paul, 23267A.
 Ballou, Charles Davison, 23266A.
 Richardson, Robert Brooks, 23494A.
 Eames, Eugene George, 23322A.
 × Fischer, James Elry, 23335A.
 × Swanson, Stanley Runyan, 23543A.
 × Haaren, John Arthur, 23355A.
 × Joyce, Robert Thomas, 23388A.
 Harvey, Charles Vincent, 23359A.
 × Hines, Frank Lewis, 23369A.

- Severs, George Edward, 23515A.
 × Liontas, Nicholas Arthur, 23420A.
 × Smith, Jimmy Lee, 23527A.
 Williamson, Donald Nelson, 23570A.
 × LeMoal, Andrew Yves, 23413A.
 × Sorrentino, Michael Louis, 23532A.
 × Henderson, William Simpson, Jr., 23363A.
 × Vining, Robert Winfield, 23557A.
 Champlin, Calbraith Perry, Jr., 23294A.
 Smyth, Robert Turner, 23530A.
 × Lepthien, William Gilmore, 23416A.
 Murphy, Thomas John, 23465A.
 × Knapp, Walter Charles, 23403A.
 × Panchisin, John Edward, 23477A.
 × Bernier, Francis William, 23272A.
 × Stolle, Thomas Joseph, 23538A.
 Ludlam, Douglas Glen, Jr., 23423A.
 Walls, Thomas Edward, 23559A.
 × Shaw, Ronald Glenn, 23516A.
 × Webster, Sherman Lile, 23564A.
 Baker, Richard Julian, 23263A.
 Honaker, Jimmie Scott, 23372A.
 × Price, George Edward, Jr., 23485A.
 × Bell, Robert Graham, 23271A.
 × Foley, John Joseph, Jr., 23336A.
 × Elrod, William Herbert, Jr., 23325A.
 × McKinley, Jack Stanley, 23453A.
 × Dow, Maynard Weston, 23320A.
 Link, James Frederick, 23418A.
 × Waldrop, William Thomas, 23558A.
 Charneski, Mitchell D., 23429A.
 Tanguy, Robert Bringham, 23547A.
 × Hewitt, Lester Rollin, Jr., 23366A.
 × Macik, John, 23427A.
 Simon, Joseph Searle, 23520A.
 × Paris, James Patrick, 23478A.
 Giles, Charles Walton, 23344A.
 × Guzman, Santiago, Jr., 23354A.
 × Oliphant, Marcus Ray, 23471A.
 × Smith, Ferris MacArthur, 23525A.
 × Jordan, Roy Harding, 23387A.
 × Abbott, Mark Oliver, 23257A.
 × Boone, Daniel, 23275A.
 Brooks, Loren Read, 23280A.
 × Karbus, Joseph Eugene, 23391A.
 × Smith, David Sheridan, 23524A.
 Simmons, Raymond Charles, 23519A.
 × McConnell, William Ellsworth, 23446A.
 O'Grady, John Francis, 23470A.
 × Celec, Martin Joseph, 23293A.
 × Martin, Arthur Thomas, 23434A.
 × Cawthon, Harry Willis, 23292A.
 McClelland, William James, 23444A.
 × Crehan, Alfred Emmanuel, 23305A.
 × Falgoust, Jean Barry, 23332A.
 × Gregg, Stanley Lee, 23352A.
 × Anderson, John Hackett, 23972A.
 × Davis, Walter Joseph, 23976A.
 × Bannerman, James William, 23980A.
 × Mitz, Eugene Raymond, 23969A.
 × Bastedo, William Gardner, 23989A.
 × Graham, William Ragan, 23994A.
 × Fry, Clarence Berger, 23996A.
 × Young, Frank Russell, 3d, 24004A.
 × Conklin, James Albert, 23977A.
 × Cole, Ardis Michael, 23973A.
 Culpepper, Burford Wallace, 23978A.
 × Thurnau, Gerald Samuel, 23986A.
 × Bailey, Hugh Dowden, Jr., 23997A.
 × Ripley, Robert Alan, 24000A.
 Middlebrooks, Burton Stone, 24002A.
 Taylor, Arthur Kibby, 23992A.
 × Nichols, William Mead, 23993A.
 × Holley, Edward Eugene, 23995A.
 × Spencer, Edward Lee, Jr., 23998A.
 × Owen, David Hugh, Jr., 23999A.
 × Trauth, Ignatius Charles, Jr., 24001A.
 × Griffith, Kenneth Edward, 23975A.
 × Bullard, Nathaniel Grayham, 23982A.
 Carlson, Eric Wilburn, 23985A.
 Leming, Paul Jones, Jr., 23988A.
 × Schmidt, Edwin Victor, Jr., 23966A.
 Webber, Leon Bruce, 23971A.
 × Jones, Charles Thomas Vaughn, 23984A.
 × Dominguez, Luis Frutoso, 23990A.
 × Young, Durward Dudley, Jr., 23965A.
 Hatfield, William Harold, 23979A.
 Cragin, John Richard, 26616A.
 Smathers, Paul Eugene, 24018A.
 × Hood, Edward Exum, Jr., 24028A.
 × Hansrote, Lawrence Shultz, 24012A.
 × Deutsch, Jeffrey Stanton, 24013A.
 × Lockamy, Vance Millard, Jr., 24023A.
 Farrar, Howard Ashby, 24024A.
 Cheatham, Daniel Washington, Jr., 24029A.
 × Covington, Richard Edward, 24020A.
 × Bultmann, Edward Henry, Jr., 24007A.
 × Zink, David Daniel, 2d, 24006A.
 × Baxter, David Alexander, 24009A.
 × Harris, Donald Joseph, 24021A.
 × Horras, John Beall, 24025A.
 × Green, William Thomas, 24030A.
 McIntire, Scott Winston, 24005A.
 × Clifford, Donald William, 24011A.
 Wood, John Thurston, 24010A.
 × Nelson, Charles Langford, 24016A.
 × Giltner, William Clarence, 24008A.
 × McLean, John Michael, 24017A.
 × Panian, Richard Paul, 24027A.
 Roberts, Lee Walton, 26617A.
 × Putnam, James Otis, 24034A.
 × Wingerson, Richard C., 24037A.
 × Jamar, John Woodbridge, 24032A.
 × Welch, Jasper Arthur, Jr., 24042A.
 × Landis, George Richard, 24033A.
 × Burkholder, William Russell, 24036A.
 × Baker, Jay Frank, 24040A.
 × Black, Gareth Hunt, 24031A.
 Kaye, Charles Forbes, 24035A.
 × Matthews, Edward Kay, 24039A.
 × Porter, Edwin Henderson, Jr., 24041A.
 × Beyer, John Herman, 24038A.
 × Widing, Joseph William, Jr., 24053A.
 × Elpi, John Daniel, 24057A.
 × Morgan, Robert Walter, 24049A.
 × Hastler, Russell Clifford, Jr., 24044A.
 × Eckert, Don Charles, 24050A.
 × Mitchell, James Kenneth, Jr., 24054A.
 × Badgett, Charles Shepard, 3d, 24055A.
 × Thompson, William Albert, Jr., 24058A.
 × Strong, Michael Lincoln, 24063A.
 × Brantley, Raymond Bryant, Jr., 24064A.
 Albright, John Raymond, 24047A.
 × Letourneau, Vernon Roland, 24052A.
 × Hull, Roland Grosvenor, 24056A.
 × Kershaw, Junius Harold, Jr., 24043A.
 × Beaudoin, David King, 24048A.
 × Walter, William Chester, 24045A.
 × Brennehan, James Millard, 24046A.
 Douglas, Edward Peter, 24051A.
 × Dean, William Evans, 24080A.
 × Craven, Joseph Hyer, Jr., 24061A.
 × McCallister, Frank Wesley, Jr., 24059A.
 Costin, Mina Patricia, 27034W.
 Kitchens, Ralph Lester, 24093A.
 Schrank, Wilburn Ronold, 27035A.
 × Gomez, Raymond Victor, 24070A.
 × Frantz, John Joseph, 24083A.
 × Cobb, Earnest, 24068A.
 × Anderson, Ronald Edson, 24069A.
 × Miller, Ennis Fulton Prospus, 24075A.
 × Jameson, William James, 24086A.
 × Morrow, John David, 24087A.
 × Florence, Mitchell Garth, 24092A.
 × Rehblen, Richard Delvine, 23255A.
 Sermon, Thomas Duane, 24073A.
 × Sweet, Wayne Anthony, 24077A.
 Graubard, Peter Arthur, 24080A.
 Matasick, Robert Anthony, 24088A.
 × Shissler, Charles Ernest, 24067A.
 × Leestamper, Robert Eugene, 24076A.
 × Herman, James Henry, 24081A.
 × Grosse, Armin Ernest, 24082A.
 × Balcer, Raymond Loon, 24085A.
 × Sparr, Daniel Beattie, 24066A.
 × Stephenson, Claude D., Jr., 24072A.
 × Taylor, Wilford Hall, 24074A.
 × Koonce, James Fitzhugh, 24084A.
 Orloff, Wayne Dale, 24089A.
 × Maxson, Frederick Gordon, 24091A.
 × Doty, Jack Emerson, 24875A.
 × Herbenner, Gerald Everett, Jr., 24876A.
 × Payne, Chester James, 24877A.
 Gunst, Richard Austin, 24094A.
 × Larson, Richard Albert, 24095A.
 × Burkardt, Edward Adolph, 24097A.
 × Hilden, Jack Gilbert, 24096A.
 Lawrence, Paul Clark, Sr., 25360A.
 × Agre, Oscar William, Jr., 25357A.
 McClintock, Herbert Howard, 25361A.
 × Uhl, Charles Wellington, 25363A.
 × DeSchon, Theodore James, 25358A.
 × Ramsdale, Charles Frederick, 26618A.
 Taylor, Harry King, 27036A.
 Webb, James Cameron, 27037A.
 × Dickhaus, Alfred Joseph, 24286A.
 Vise, Bernard, 24277A.
 Oakes, David Logan, 24275A.
 Hoag, Earl Jerome, Jr., 24282A.
 × Dupree, Forist Gleaton, 24274A.
 Carter, Leland Wayne, 24272A.
 × Swarts, James Cleon, 24290A.
 Kahler, Richard Eugene, 24289A.
 Hill, Robert Bradford, 24281A.
 Freeman, Frederick Clifton, Jr., 24280A.
 Fullerton, Jerry Edwin, 24287A.
 Malone, James Joseph, 24279A.
 × Lemcke, Theodore Foster, 24283A.
 × Stratton, Charles Bailey, 24284A.
 × Sumner, Bryan, 24285A.
 Walker, Thomas Marshal, 26619A.
 Smith, Fendrick Jefferson, Jr., 27039A.
 Shearer, Lowell Elwin, 27038A.
 Chamblee, Marion Franklin, 2740A.
 Robins, Kenneth Eugene, 27041A.
 Hatfield, Richard Cecil, 24099A.
 Sawhill, Robert Ralston, Jr., 24101A.
 Stanley, Richard Cleve, 27042A.
 × Thompson, John Paul, 24102A.
 Bohren, Theodore Fred, 24103A.
 Cash, James Harvey, 27043A.
 Mitchell, William Royster, 24879A.
 York, Charles Alvin, 26620A.
 × Weed, Gordon Harold, 24169A.
 × Bradford, Jimmie Lee, 24172A.
 × Massingill, Bobby Joe, 24170A.
 × Kading, Richard Batker, Jr., 24171A.
 Strom, Elmer Lawrence, 27044A.
 Kraus, Douglas Arthur, 27045A.
 × Troutman, Ray Kent, 24178A.
 × DeLong, Richard Allen, 24176A.
 × Fix, Oliver Wilbur, 24175A.
 × Beveridge, George Graham, 24177A.
 Chambers, Robert Jefferson, 24174A.
 Holway, Warren Arthur, 24882A.
 × Eaton, Elbridge Perley, Jr., 24881A.
 McCarthy, James Russell, 26621A.
 Geiss, Robert Charles, 27046A.
 McComb, Charles Wight, 24182A.
 × Poad, William James, 24183A.
 × Peerson, Andrew Francis Petrovich, 24180A.
 Davis, Clarence Sylvester, Jr., 24181A.
 Thompson, James Knox, 24298A.
 × Schmidt, Clarence Bartle, 2d, 24295A.
 × Robinson, Robert Wilson, 24293A.
 × Boyd, William Barringer, 24291A.
 Allan, Karl Christopher, 24296A.
 × Cady, David Alan Edmund, 24297A.
 × Grady, Walter Hazard, 24292A.
 Singer, William Edmond, 24294A.
 × Walker, Melvin Keith, 24299A.
 Kilbride, Wade Robert, 26623A.
 Thompson, James Leroy, 26624A.
 Stegman, Ralph Leon, 26622A.
 Anderson, Donald Terry, 27047A.
 Johnson, Donald Carl, 27050A.
 Chapman, Albert Edward, Jr., 27049A.
 Franklin, Robert Andrew, 27048A.
 × Harrington, Robert Arthur, 24184A.
 Campbell, William Edward, 27051A.
 Johnson, Julian Crawford, Jr., 27052A.
 Harrison, James William, Jr., 27055A.
 Dresser, Ralph Claude, 27054A.
 Coffman, Carl Keith, 27053A.
 Ohman, Kenneth Dale, 27057A.
 Sullivan, Richard Lawrence, 27056A.
 Obarr, Frederick Counts, 27058A.
 Moore, Brian Girard, 27059A.
 × Blanton, Charles Cleveland, 24300A.
 × Jacobsmeyer, John Henry, Jr., 24305A.
 Goldsby, Arthur Kenneth, Jr., 24303A.
 Bertrand, Richard Ernest, 24304A.
 × German, James Arter, 24301A.
 × Davidson, John, 24302A.
 × Montgomery, Warren Everett, 24306A.
 × Lyons, Lewis Melick, 24884A.
 Wise, Lucien David, 26625A.
 Blais, David Edward, 27060A.
 Conaway, Lawrence Yerges, 27061A.
 Marinelli, Peter Anthony, 27063A.
 Stafford, Herman Charles, Jr., 27062A.
 Herzwurm, Ernest John, 27064A.
 Baily, Carl Griffith, 27066A.
 Burns, Curtis Marklyn, 27067A.
 Greif, Arthur George, Jr., 27065A.
 Dennis, Howell Anderson, 27069A.

Cantrell, Wayne Edward, 27068A.
 Comeau, Paul Theodore, 27070A.
 Thomas, John Paul, 26626A.
 Reyes, Raymond, Victor, Jr., 27071A.
 Harr, Minnis Charles, 24608A.
 Probst, Gerald Graham, 24607A.
 × Latham, Edward Gillespie, Jr., 26627A.
 Culp, James William, 27072A.
 Brumfield, Richard Clayton, 27073A.
 Gilk, Frank Edward, 27074A.
 Hillebrandt, Leonard Gordon, Jr., 24888A.
 Strong, Lowell Martin, 24889A.
 × Berkman, William Worrall, 24887A.
 Clark, Norman Johnson, 27075A.
 × Callaway, Edward Pierce, 24621A.
 × Cooper, John Raymond, 24622A.
 March, Donald Ross, 24890A.
 × Suggs, Jack Wofford, 24891A.
 Gale, Mark David, 27076A.
 Lambert, Joseph Karl, 27077A.
 Hansen, John, 27078A.
 Stahl, David Whittingham, 27079A.
 Coverdale, Robert Frederick, 27081A.
 DeMent, Kenneth Park, 27080A.
 × Saunders, James Woodward, Jr., 25369A.
 × Bubba, Lawrence Frank, 25368A.
 × Killgore, James Alvan, 24623A.
 × Carpenter, Robert Thomas, 24625A.
 × Branson, Dean Howell, 24893A.
 Schultz, Robert Augie, 25644A.
 × Stehlin, Joseph Charles, Jr., 25692A.
 Crosby, Mary Lavinia, 27083W.
 Beverly, Chester Arthur, Jr., 27082A.
 Zaworski, Donald Lewis, 24911A.
 × Dodson, Jerome Roger, Jr., 24905A.
 × James, James Kendall, 24899A.
 × Harmer, Torr Wagner, Jr., 24906A.
 × Plaster, Larry Egbert, 24896A.
 × Henderson, Martin Fick, 24907A.
 Allen, Nelson, 24897A.
 Allison, Glen Wesley, 24894A.
 × Jacobus, Frederick Billings, 24902A.
 Schramm, Joseph Vincent, 24908A.
 × Sweet, Cyrus Bardeen, 3d, 24910A.
 × Boyden, Robert Winfield, 24903A.
 × Clay, Ted Norris, 24898A.
 × McClelland, James Norman, 24900A.
 × McIntire, Daniel Stuart, Jr., 24895A.
 Montgomery, Marshall Adam, Jr., 25370A.
 × Finnegan, Francis Patrick, Jr., 24901A.
 Howard, Joe Ed, 27084A.
 Keebaugh, Eldon Lee, 27087A.
 Slater, Robert Thomas, 27085A.
 Williams, Conrad Ivan, 27086A.
 Washburn, Troy Nelson, 24624A.
 Mills, Billy James, 24626A.
 × Alkman, James Howard, 25372A.
 Sprehe, Forrest Dale, 25373A.
 Schwartz, Douglas Milton, 27088A.
 Barnes, Jere Leigh, 24912A.
 Hartman, Sammy Lee, 24913A.
 Bird, Ronald Arthur, 27089A.

NURSE

× Schooley, Mildred Francis, 24257W.
 × Collavo, LaVerne Martha, 24259W.
 × Momrow, Esther Mildred, 24258W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility design-

nated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Gilbert G. Ackroyd and 748 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Gilbert G. Ackroyd, which appears on page 4897, and ending with the name of William J. Winter, Jr., which is shown on page 4900.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Malcolm H. Sawyer and 427 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 11, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Malcolm H. Sawyer, which appears on page 5191, and ending with the name of Charles O. Hopingardner, which appears on page 5193.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following groups of nominations for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, were confirmed today:

The nominations of Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., and 214 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1955, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., which appears on page 4900, and ending with the name of Willem Vanhemert, also appearing on page 4900; and

The nominations of Albert L. Abdon and 4,717 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on May 13, 1955, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Albert L. Abdon, which is shown on page 6330, and ending with the name of Adolph Ziegler, appearing on page 6340.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Carl Walter Berner, D. D., pastor of Faith Lutheran Church, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose name is holy, whose wisdom perfect, and whose love constant, we magnify and praise Thee for the multitude of Thy mercies upon our people—Thy blessings in field and factory, in homes and offices, in church and state.

Most of all do we acknowledge in humble thanksgiving the gift of Thy divine Gospel whereby our hearts and minds are filled with the peace that passeth all understanding.

Enable us in trust and confidence to walk upon that costly bridge built in the

grace of our divine Saviour, who resolved the difference between Thy holiness and our unholiness.

Let Thy richest benediction rest upon this assembly and the high purpose which it serves. Endow Thy servants with wisdom, that we may do our work as a stewardship and a divine vocation, so that in all things Thy will be done and Thy work established.

These petitions we ask in the name and to the glory of our divine Saviour, Jesus Christ, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost lives and reigns, one God forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 20, 1955, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is considering the Salk vaccine problem, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EMPLOYMENT OF A RETIRED NAVAL OFFICER IN CONNECTION WITH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954 (with an